

LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of Labour Unity

Founded 1921

Editor : R. Palme Dutt

- From Brighton to
Scarborough** * R.P.D.
- Security - or Nazis
Re-armed ?** * Ben Parkin, M.P.
- The End of E.D.C.** * Edouard Herriot
- Trade Unions on the March** * W. C. Stevens
- Tai-wan and Manila** * R. Page Arnot
- Who are the Allies
of the Neo-Nazis ?** * Judith Todd
- China and Tibet** * The Dalai Lama

October, 1954

One shilling and sixpence



NINE HOURS ON TYNE



WHEN engineers on Tyneside struck to limit the working day to nine hours, the employers imported foreign labour from Germany and Belgium. Things looked grim on Tyneside that summer of 1871. Then the strikers appealed to the Council of the International Working Men's Association—the First International, whose 90th anniversary we celebrated last month. Karl Marx was playing an active part in it; instant support was forthcoming. By advertising, rallying affiliated bodies and visiting the Continent and the quayside when the boatloads arrived, the International's representatives checkmated the employers' move. The foreign workers went home; the British engineers won their strike after five months' struggle. Many living today on the North-East Coast must have heard their engineer grandfathers tell of that proof of what international unity can do. So I found it moving that it should be an A.E.U. delegate to the T.U.C., 83 years later, who proposed the resolution calling for talks between world trade union bodies, to agree on a programme for economic demands. As every thinking engineer and shipwright knows, that delegate was right in saying that expanding living standards and preserving peace demands such co-operation between international trade unions. Moreover, despite the hard-won five-day week, how many engineers today are in practice working more than nine hours daily? Food for thought in

the workshop, where once again foreign policy can be seen to be a bread-and-butter wage question; see W. C. Stevens' thought-provoking article on p. 459. Until now these questions have not been so obvious to the younger trade unionists. Hence, perhaps, the great response from the branches of an engineering union to which we circulated the new Midget L.M., to introduce more widely to the younger man and woman the magazine their parents have relied on for a generation. As one secretary remarked, ordering a four-month trial subscription: 'Several already have it in our branch, but I hope this will get others reading it.' Another trade union branch secretary put it like this: *'It is these younger members of our fraternity who need the stimulating effects of L.M. It makes them feel there is something worth living and worth fighting for. Yet we have to be tactful in approaching the younger generation; they are sensitive and partially blinded politically and economically by capitalist environment.'*

Whetting Appetites

WILL we circularise branches of other unions, many have asked. If you want us to circularise your own, give us the details. Apart from that, we are open to persuasion; but with limited supplies we want the Midget to go where we are assured it will do most good. An enthusiastic Londoner exclaims that 'it's worth its

(Continued on page iii of cover)

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: From Brighton to Scarborough, by R.P.D. ..	433
SECURITY—OR NAZIS RE-ARMED? by Ben Parkin, M.P.	447
THE END OF E.D.C., by Edouard Herriot	451
TRADE UNIONS ON THE MARCH, by W. C. Stevens	459
TAI-WAN AND MANILA, by R. Page Arnot	463
CHINA AND TIBET, by the Dalai Lama	468
WHO ARE THE ALLIES OF THE NEO-NAZIS? by Judith Todd	470
DEBATE ON COLONIES AT BRIGHTON T.U.C.: Jack Grahl; Abe Moffat; Arthur Horner	473
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	467
Illustrations: On the Fifth Anniversary of the Chinese People's Republic: Lino engravings by Geoff. Miller	456-457

Book Reviews:

Literature in New China: <i>William Locke</i>	477
Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. II: <i>Benjamin Farrington</i> ..	479

Notes of the Month

From Brighton to Scarborough

'There must be no question of Germany's being included in the military system of the Atlantic Powers.'

WALTER LIPPMANN, 'America's War Aims', 1944.

EIGHTY-THREE years ago the poet Swinburne looked forward to the day when the voice of liberty
shall awake from the tomb
England, and France from her prison,
Sisters, a star by a star.

The 'tomb' and the 'prison' were then not yet open foreign domination and foreign military occupation. But today the peoples of Britain and France have begun to move forward together, for the national freedom of their countries and for peace, to defeat the

criminal war plans and to ensure that German militarism shall never again devastate Europe. This is the great new fact of the situation which is rocking the war camp. The French people through their parliament have killed the E.D.C. war plot. The British people, deprived of corresponding democratic possibilities through a parliament controlled from above, have expressed their will through their mass trade union organisations. The vote of three and a half million trade unionists at Brighton, representing the overwhelming majority of those whose wishes were consulted, and following the decision of the eleven millions at the Co-operative Congress, has struck a blow against the attempts to put through an alternative form of Nazi rearmament. With unconcealed alarm the leaders of the war camp calculate the possibility of defeat at the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough. Assuredly they will use every device and manoeuvre to seek to control the outcome. But there can be no question of the will of the masses of the people. The battle for peace is reaching a new height alike in Europe and in Asia. The desperation of the war camp is expressed in their intensified offensive, with their new military measures in the Far East, and their new plans to force through Nazi rearmament in Europe. But resistance is rising. No longer only India and China and the nations of Asia, the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, but the peoples of France and Britain and Western Europe have moved into action for peace. If they exert their full strength, there can be no doubt of the outcome.

France Resurgent

The debate and the vote of the French National Assembly which killed E.D.C. on August 30 was a landmark for Europe. France reaffirmed her national independence and took the first step to throw off the evil dream of the rule of the puppets, the Bidaults and the Schumans. Through all the imperfections of political forms and a deliberately gerrymandered electoral system democracy nevertheless spoke and made its voice heard in a way which would be less easily practicable in the controlled and regimented parliamentary institutions of Britain. The pundits of British parliamentarism are accustomed to sneer at French parliamentary institutions, the multiplicity of parties actually reflecting, instead of concealing, the various shades of public opinion, and the transience of Cabinets installed and dismissed by the will of a sovereign parliament. It is profoundly shocking to these enemies of democracy that the elected representatives of the people should dare to arrogate to themselves the right to

control the Executive and its policy, in place of being controlled by the Executive, with a rare 'free vote' once in a blue moon on a secondary issue. But in France the democratic tradition still lingers.

Democracy and Parliament

The overwhelming pressure of public opinion exerted itself on the parliamentary representatives, split every party except the Communist Party—which alone truly reflected the national will and therefore suffered no split—and compelled parliament to act. The will of parliament brought down Laniel and his replacement by Mendès-France on a programme of peace in Indo-China and Tunis and settlement of E.D.C. Six parliamentary commissions, representing all parties, thrashed out and voted on all the questions involved in E.D.C. from every angle, foreign affairs, military, financial, etc.; and their net verdict revealed 144 to 86 against, with a hostile verdict on every one of the six commissions, before the debate began. There are no such commissions in the British parliament to thrash out the vital questions of policy before the final parliamentary debate is staged as a purely theatrical performance to ratify a policy already determined by the government, with the Whips on to ensure the verdict beforehand. When Premier Mendès-France, succumbing to pressure from the Right, announced his Cabinet's decision to postpone the vote for six weeks in order to resume the Brussels negotiations, such a decision of the Cabinet would have been final for the time-table of a British parliament. Not in the French parliament. The rank-and-file Commission for Foreign Affairs met to discuss and override the Cabinet's decision, and decided by 24 votes to 20 to approve the presentation of a motion for the previous question, if a straight vote was obstructed by the Right. Thus the final majority of 55 which killed E.D.C. was on a procedural motion. Had it been a straight vote, Mendès-France has since declared, there would have been a majority of 110 against E.D.C. It was a decisive expression of the majority of parliamentary representatives, drawn from all parties.

Voice of the Nation

Thus the will of the nation succeeded in finding an expression through parliament. An 'Alliance of Communists and the Extreme Right', proclaimed the *Daily Herald* on September 1, killed E.D.C. A curious conception of the 'Extreme Right' to include, not only such honoured representatives of French patriotism and democratic

traditions as an Herriot, but also the majority of the Socialist Party deputies, despite the threats of discipline of a machine in the service of American imperialism. However, the *Daily Herald* could have the satisfaction of finding its view shared by the Extreme Right Dulles, who denounced 'Nationalism and Communism' as responsible for the French vote. In the eyes of a Dulles the crime of 'Nationalism' is the desire of a nation for independence in place of coming under the American rod or the Nazi jackboot. The discovery that a nation could refuse to sell itself for dollars was shocking to the high-minded 'supra-national' idealism of a Dulles. In the acid words of *The Times*' Washington correspondent, writing on September 1 after the event:

American policy both in Indo-China and in Europe has in fact been based on dangerous assumptions. The assumptions have been that, if the United States gave France enough money, she would go on fighting in Indo-China for as long as necessary, and that, if the United States exerted enough pressure, she would, regardless of the real opinions of the deputies, ratify E.D.C. when it was finally brought to a vote.

It was these last assumptions that account for the prolonged optimism of all officials here, who considered irrelevant enquiries about how many members of Congress or of the Parliament at Westminster would be prepared to vote to relinquish sovereignty.

The sting of that remark lies in its tail, with its oblique hint that even the supine British parliament may finally jib at surrendering sovereignty to the United States.

Communism and the Nation

But indeed it is not necessary to cross the ocean to discover the identity of outlook of the *Daily Herald*, the voice of the Extreme Right of the Labour Party, with the Extreme Right of monopoly capitalism, represented by a Dulles. The organ of right-wing Labour, so zealous to warn against alliances with the Extreme Right, could find a still closer ally in the patron of neo-Nazi militarism, Dr. Adenauer, whose policy it has so consistently defended against the policy of the German Social Democrats. In the hectoring tones customary from these exalted quarters Premier Adenauer in his broadcast denounced the democratic vote of the French parliament as a mere expression of 'Gaullists, Communists and the disgruntled'. Assuming the mantle of a Hitler, and carried away by the illusion that he could already dictate and lecture to 'our' Western Europe, he proclaimed the warning that 'in Paris we have a strong Communist foothold. The goodwill which Germany has shown since the end of the war has been disappointed'. Ungrateful French, who

have so soon forgotten the blessings of Oradour, and have preferred to give their main support to the Party of the 75,000 executed by Nazism, to the Communist Party. With bland contempt for democracy Adenauer and his associates in other countries seek to deduct the 99 Communist votes in order to 'disprove' the majority. 'It is absurd', ranted neo-Hitler Adenauer on September 5, 'that it should be possible for 100 members of the French National Assembly, casting their votes as ordered by Moscow, to influence and even decide the destiny of Europe.' Quite like old times. Of course Communism should be outlawed, as all good Hitlerites will admit, and as Dulles and Eisenhower have hastened to carry out. What matter that the French electors have consistently given their first support to the Communist Party, and have increased that support at every electoral test? Such democratic arithmetic is 'absurd'. Indeed, the electoral system was already changed to cut down their rightful representation by one-third, so that the real significance of the counting of numbers is the opposite. Every one of the 99 French Communist deputies in that vote represented many more electors than any of the other deputies. Communism was revealed by that vote as the true voice of the French nation.

What France Demands

The effects of the vote of the French Assembly went far beyond the defeat of the specific plan for Nazi rearmament embodied in E.D.C. It was the whole policy of the American war plans in Europe, centred in the rearmament of Nazism and the partition of Germany and Europe into opposing armed camps, which received a deadly blow. The heavily curtailed, not to say censored, reports of the debate in the English press concealed this truth. The two authoritative speeches of the spokesmen of the majority were those of Moch and Herriot. Moch, speaking for the Commission of Foreign Affairs, set out four main grounds of opposition to E.D.C.:

- (1) that it is 'in contradiction to the Pacts of Moscow, Yalta, Potsdam and London, which set the aim of the disarmament and demilitarisation of Germany' (omitted in every British newspaper except the *Daily Worker*);
- (2) that it destroys French national sovereignty;
- (3) that it 'shatters the efforts to consolidate peace'; this was declared to be *the main reason*, 'the issue which dominates everything';
- (4) that it involves the risk 'almost inevitably to provoke an offensive to the East for a preventive war'.

Small room for misunderstanding here.

Blinkers for Britain

It is a shocking indication of the dishonesty of the official supporters of Nazi rearmament that the British press in general, in reporting this authoritative statement of the French majority viewpoint on this key question, gave *only* the second point, the objection to the violation of French national independence (thus implying that it was only a question of the special formula of E.D.C.), and completely omitted the other three points, the main grounds of objection, that *any* German rearmament would be a violation of war-time agreements and a preparation for aggressive war to the East, and that the French nation demanded instead renewed negotiations for a united Germany without rearmament and for a peaceful settlement for the whole of Europe. Herriot, whose speech was the climax of the debate, went even further in specifically demanding renewed negotiations with the Soviet Union to secure a united peaceful settlement for all Europe, and declared, on the basis of his experience since he carried through the agreement with the Soviet Union in 1924, that he knew of no difficulties from the Soviet side. We print the text of this supremely important pronouncement of France's Elder Statesman, in order that it shall be available for English readers.

Squaring the Circle

Thus the entire subsequent Anglo-American official policy, as also of right-wing Labour, to treat the death of E.D.C. as merely the death of a particular formula, requiring an alternative formula for the same aim of Nazi rearmament and incorporation in a Western military bloc, whether through N.A.T.O., the Brussels Pact or the like, is based on a bland and shameless ignoring of French national opinion and a cool assumption that France can be bought or bullied into acceptance. All the plans were ready. The Anglo-American Committee of Experts had the blueprints ready for the day after France rejected E.D.C., to put into force at once the Bonn Agreement for the sovereignty of Adenauer, preparing the way for rearmament. The American stockpile of arms was labelled and ready for immediate dispatch to Western Germany, irrespective of the French vote. And then they began to discover the hitch. On the one hand, Adenauer raised his terms and would no longer be satisfied with the Bonn Agreement. The United States, through the mouth of Senator Wiley, demanded '100 per cent. sovereignty' for Adenauer, *i.e.*, unlimited rearmament (the plan prepared with

General Gruenther for 48 divisions, as revealed by Schmidt-Wittmack). On the other hand, they discovered that they could not legally take a step without the agreement of France. The Occupation Statute could not be changed without the agreement of France as joint Occupying Power. The rearmament plan could not be put into operation in Western Germany without the agreement of France. The N.A.T.O. Constitution could not permit the inclusion of Western Germany without the agreement of France. The French National Assembly is adjourned till November (with a promise of recall, if necessary, to hear, but not to decide on any negotiations taking place). Mendès-France has pledged that any new plan, either for Western German sovereignty or rearmament, will be submitted to the decision of the National Assembly. How much likelihood would there be that the same National Assembly, which had so decisively rejected E.D.C., would now willingly accept naked Nazi rearmament?

France Holds the Trumps

As this situation has at long last begun to be realised by the would-be dictators of the Pentagon and Bonn, a howl of angry frustration has burst from them at the discovery that they are not all-powerful, and that a mere democratic parliament dare defy them ('absurd', as Adenauer has said). The leap of France towards national freedom has brought with it the possibility of all Western Europe escaping from the net.

The political difficulties in the way of German rearmament are considerably greater than the American policy-makers like to admit in public. . . . This country occupying only one-third of West Germany, cannot just decree West German rearmament. It will be very difficult in fact to force the French to accept West German rearmament even if Britain and America achieved a strong and solid united front on the matter. And despite the agreement in principle between Secretary Dulles and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, that kind of Anglo-American united front is going to be very hard to achieve. It may even be impossible to achieve.

(Alsop Brothers, *New York Herald Tribune*, August 27, 1954.)

The United States 'cannot just decree West German rearmament'. The previous easy talk about settling it directly between Dulles and Eisenhower, if France refuses, is discovered not to be so easy in practice. France cannot be ignored. The cruder and more stupid type of bully, like the *Economist* of September 4, can bray aloud to ignore the French and go ahead on the basis of the United States, Britain and Adenauer ('with the French if they will; but without them, if they will not'). But the real situation is not so simple.

France Leads for Peace

It is true that the rights of France under the Occupation Statute or the N.A.T.O. Constitution are merely legal rights; and the lords of the Atlantic Pact, who have driven a bull-dozer through every obligation of Yalta, Potsdam or the United Nations Charter, are not likely to be held back by considerations of legality. But the proposal to force through West German rearmament without the agreement of France, that is, *against* France, would carry with it practical consequences defeating the objective. For in such a situation of a revived German militarism established openly against the wishes of France, in self-protection France would inevitably move to closer relations with the Soviet Union; the Polish offer of a Treaty is open; the whole situation in Europe would become reversed. The 'old alliances' could be established anew, no longer with weak, rotten, decaying anti-popular states, but with powerful, advancing, progressive states and nations. In other words, France has an alternative, as her best statesmen have clearly seen. Therefore the supreme objective of the American war policy and its supporters in Britain becomes at all costs to force, bribe, hoodwink, coax, cajole, browbeat or bully France into acceptance of Nazi rearmament. As with Hitler, they are discovering that the road to their war in the East requires first the conquest of France. This glorious task is accordingly assigned to Britain.

Why Should Britain Bully France?

So we get the ignominious spectacle of the British Foreign Secretary touring the capitals of Western Europe in order to tout for Nazi rearmament and provide some semblance of a 'plan' in time for Scarborough (the original British proposal to hustle a Nine-Power Conference on September 14 in time for Scarborough broke down before the obstacles). So we get the pressure on the weak and compliant Mendès-France to retract his former refusal and sign the blank negative reply of the three Western Powers to the Soviet proposal for a conference for collective security in Europe—a reply in flat contradiction to the expressed wishes of the spokesmen of the majority of the French National Assembly. But why should Britain bully France in the interests of Adenauer, in place of standing with France against the revival of German militarism? This is the crucial question. This is the most fatal flaw in the entire Churchill-Eden policy, which in other respects, especially in relation to the Far East, has groped towards some faint gestures of partial resistance to American pressure and support for negotiated settle-

mènts, às at Genève, but on this crucial question of the future of Europe has thrown away the opportunity offered by France to win freedom from American domination and peace for Europe, and has so far preferred to link up with the neo-Nazism represented by Adenauer and with Dulles against Britain's old ally.

Memories of Munich

No doubt there may be a certain Churchillian calculation in these manoeuvres, as the attempt to revive the long-buried Western Union of Bevin indicates, and as the anxious pursuit by the United States envoy Murphy on the trail of Eden suggests, to outbid the U.S. and to resume the old British aim of leadership of 'Little Europe' in place of either the U.S. or France or Adenauer. But the rottenness of such calculations has long been demonstrated. The Bevin design soon collapsed before the alliance of the U.S. and Adenauer, the Brussels Pact was merged in the Atlantic Pact, and Britain ostentatiously moved out of 'Little Europe' and E.D.C., leaving France to hold the baby. The outcome of such manoeuvres has only played and can only play into the hands of Adenauer and Dulles. The question remains. When the united common stand of Britain and France, in co-operation with the Soviet Union, against the revival of Nazi militarism and against American domination, corresponds to the vital interest of both countries and all Europe and when such a common stand could ensure success, why does the Churchill Government rebuff the friends of Britain in favour of those who are most certainly no friends of Britain? Why bully France in order to build up Adenauer? Why? The hideous spectacle of Munich, with Chamberlain bullying France to surrender to Hitler's demands, is renewed. British reaction's fear of democracy resurgent in France, of the looming vision of the Popular Front in France and the Peace Front in Europe with all that that would mean for the speedy advance of the progress of the peoples throughout Europe, is driving the blind leaders of British reaction, once again on the fatal path of betrayal of Britain's vital interests.

Let Labour Speak for Britain

At this fateful moment, once more as at the time of Munich, it is the British Labour movement that can and must speak for Britain and save Britain. This is the supreme importance of the battle at the Brighton Trades Union Congress and the Scarborough Labour Party Conference, not only for the future of the Labour movement,

but for the future and very existence of Britain and of peace. It is characteristic and significant that at this moment the brutal and outspoken voice of the City, the *Economist*, should shamelessly proclaim its choice to prefer Adenauer to France.

A nervous, isolated and neurotic France may well be frightened off once again and try to impose another veto. If so, there will have to be straight talk from London and Washington. If the Americans and the British now find themselves compelled to give Dr. Adenauer almost anything he asks for—if they are compelled, either in reality or at least in appearance, to prefer Germany to France—that is the fault of France.

(*Economist*, September 4, 1954.)

‘To prefer Germany to France’. The cat is out of the bag. It is an insult to the British people to dare to suggest to them that they should prefer the neo-Nazi clique round Adenauer, the Ruhr barons and the militarists to French democracy, because the French people, equally with the majority of the German people and all the nations of Europe, demand peace and no revival of German militarism, a peaceful united Germany and collective security for Europe. On the contrary, the interests of the British people stand four-square with the French people in the common fight for national independence and for peace. The French people have nobly played their part. They have placed the ball at our feet. It is now the hour of choice for Britain. If the British people can prevent their Government from seeking to coerce France into accepting the revival of German militarism, if they can range Britain with France, with the Soviet Union, with all the democratic forces in Germany and in all Europe, for collective peace for Europe, the battle for peace can be won. This is the supreme responsibility for Labour today, which carries with it the whole future for a revitalised Labour movement to lead Britain. This is the significance of the battles at Brighton and at Scarborough.

Lessons of Brighton

The Brighton Trades Union Congress did achieve a step forward along this road. This was the lasting achievement of Brighton. There could be no doubt of the response and concern of the main body of delegates with the burning political questions of the present international situation, which dominated, and correctly and inevitably dominated the proceedings, because they dominate every domestic problem today. Nor could there be any doubt of the new trends and profound shift of opinion taking place. It is true that the present ruling leadership of the General Council was still able

to win its customary verdicts, even though by majorities which have begun to grow visibly precarious, on most questions for its reactionary platform: for an international policy supporting the American war coalition and Nazi rearmament, and repulsing international trade union unity; and for a domestic policy inculcating wage restraint and loyal co-operation with the big monopolies, at the same time as admitting that this policy has enabled the soaring rise in profits to outstrip by far the share of wages. This was the negative aspect of the Congress. But these victories of the General Council majority were characterised by almost every press observer, irrespective of political colour, as 'hollow victories'. They represented the voice of the old order, which still holds the helm, which is still able to dominate the machine, but which has begun visibly to weaken in its effective control. What was significant in the Congress was not the old, but the new, the advance of the new and growing forces, no longer of a limited section on the left, but of wide sections, able sometimes to defeat the General Council and always able to secure substantial votes of millions, for a consistent and firmly expressed positive alternative policy which holds out a new future for trade unionism and the labour movement.

Portents of the Future

The vote of three and a half millions against German rearmament was universally recognised as a portent of major significance for British politics, despite the half million majority obtained by the General Council. Why? Not merely because this vote was far higher than had been generally predicted, but because it was universally recognised as the decisive voice of the main body of the organised working class, that is, among all the sections of the organised working class where there had been opportunities of effective expression of the opinions of the membership; and above all because it pointed, if the same proportions of voting were maintained at Scarborough, and if the trends among the divisional labour parties went according to all available indications, to the prospect of a defeat of German rearmament at the Labour Party Conference, and to a consequent crisis, not only for the present dominant leadership of the labour movement, but for the whole political situation in Britain. Nor was this an isolated phenomenon. The defeats of the General Council on rents and on the retirement age, as well as on two minor issues; the unanimous demands for the extension of public ownership in the basic industries, and for East-West trade; the votes of three millions for the electricians' motion for the sup-

port of actions for wage increases, or for British-Soviet trade union relations; and the storm of feeling on the colonial question, where the right-wing leadership had to resort to discreditable manoeuvres to prevent a vote: all these revealed the unmistakable trend, which is advancing, despite all obstacles, in British trade unionism.

Sharp Lessons

These votes revealed that the present composition of the General Council, by its artificial exclusion of many of the best known trade union figures (through an electoral system scathingly described by the spokesman of the engineers as based on 'barter, bullying and blackmail') is wholly unrepresentative of the real opinions and relations of strength among trade unionists. They revealed that the famous 'tripod', on which the right-wing leadership dominating the Council relies for its majorities, the 'tripod' of the two general unions and the miners, has become a shaky base, and that when one leg is removed (as in the two main defeats of the General Council) the majority vanishes, thereby pointing unmistakably to the future, once the miners wipe out the shame of the present narrowing domination of reaction and resume their role in the vanguard. They revealed the rising strength of the united progressive forces of trade unionism, communist and non-communist co-operating together in harmony, with the indispensable role of the Communist Party as the recognised voice of an alternative policy to that of the right-wing leadership, and thereby pointing the way also to the future for the political labour movement.

High Stakes at Scarborough

So the battle goes forward to Scarborough. It would be idle to predict the outcome by present calculations of the balance of votes or mandates, when every day the battle is advancing to new heights and each new turn of events can affect the issue. Of the will of the membership there can be no doubt. The British working class, and the entire British people, are opposed to Nazi rearmament. That has been demonstrated by every sign and test of popular feeling. It has been demonstrated in the trade unions. It has been demonstrated in the co-operative organisations. In the political labour movement it has been demonstrated at every regional conference held by the leadership. On a straight vote, if mandates were fulfilled, there could be no doubt of the outcome. But for that very reason every effort will undoubtedly be made to obscure the issue,

to confuse the vote, to produce tricky formulas, to allege new situations, and on this basis to endeavour to secure reversals of mandates and a blank cheque for the Executive. The Government and Toryism will seek to come to the rescue of the right-wing leadership. Already *The Times* has issued its disinterested marching orders to the Labour Party Conference to eschew the 'folly of attempting to define foreign policy by popular resolutions', and has pontifically insisted that 'it is essential that they (the leaders) should have a free hand in parliament, bound only by the decisions of the Parliamentary Party'. At the Trades Union Congress the General Council, caught on the wrong foot by the disappearance of E.D.C., had no concrete alternative to offer; they had to ask for a vote for a pig in a poke. But Eden is now hustling like a super-salesman to provide some 'plan' in time for Scarborough; and Dulles flies to London and Bonn, ostentatiously omitting Paris. Hence there is no room for shallow optimism to count on easy victories. The stakes are too high. The battle will be arduous. The battle will go forward at Scarborough, and it will go forward beyond Scarborough.

War Moves

We cannot wait for the gradual and ultimately inevitable advance and accumulation of majorities of the progressive forces. The enemy does not wait. Faced with the rising revolt of the peoples, the war camp is striking now. Geneva was answered by Manila. Peace in Indo-China was met by the new military pact of the non-Asian powers against the peace and national independence of the peoples of Asia. A reply of black negation has been sent to the Soviet proposal for new negotiations for a peaceful settlement for a united Germany and for collective peace in Europe. Following in the footsteps of Hitler, the United States Government outlaws the Communist Party, hamstringing the trade unions, and announces its intention 'to utterly destroy the Communist Party and all its activities'. Who would make war of aggression on other nations must first make war on his own nation to silence the voice of the people. Can British Labour fail to take heed of this warning after the precedent of Hitler? It is not enough to seek to restore ebbing political prestige by a visit to the Soviet Union and China, and to proclaim the indispensable principles of co-existence and friendship with the communist world. Co-existence and friendship begins at home, by ending the bans on friendship with the Soviet Union and China, and by ending McCarthyite proscriptions of journals or left-wing mili-

tants. While Attlee visits Peking, Dulles visits Chiang to unloose war on China. The American Security Council meets to announce every form of armed aid to Chiang's offensive, and the organ of the Government Republican Party adds that the measures already undertaken 'do not rule out a more active role for American armed forces at a later date'. Once again the American napalm bombs are falling. Such is the situation which confronts Scarborough.

No Time To Lose

There is assuredly no time to lose. Our action now will determine the future. There is no doubt that the voice of the delegates gathered at Scarborough can play a mighty role in the assembling of the forces of peace. The army of peace is growing and advancing. India has taken her stand with China to rally all Asia for peace against the American anti-Asian War Pact of Manila. The French Assembly has struck an historic blow against the war plans in Europe centred around Nazi rearmament. Adenauer is weakening in his internal situation in West Germany, as the Schleswig-Holstein elections and the increasing defections of leading figures to the German Democratic Republic have shown. The first slight shift in Britain's policy has begun. Only the full strength and action of the British working class and the British people can transform that shift into a real turn to a positive policy for peace. That is the opportunity and the responsibility of British Labour at this hour. The dangers of the present situation are high; but their height is also the measure of our opportunity. The new ferocity of the offensive of the war camp is the expression, not of their strength, but of their desperation. They know that time is not on their side. We can indeed be confident in the future. But we can only be justified in our confidence to the extent that our present action matches our present opportunity and needs; to defeat the war plans in Europe by defeating Nazi rearmament; to defeat the war plans in Asia by compelling a resolute 'No' from Britain to the American aggressive moves in the Far East; and so to open the way for new negotiations for peace in Europe and for peace in Asia. This is the high tide of the whole international situation, and of the British political situation, in which the Scarborough Conference meets.

September 15, 1954.

R.P.D.

SECURITY—OR NAZIS RE-ARMED?

BEN PARKIN, M.P.

IN exclusive clubs and such-like places there are always elderly gentlemen who will tell you that they 'understand the mentality of these foreigners'. It seems that what we ought to do is to emulate the bargaining processes observed by these well-travelled experts many years ago in Eastern markets. If you want to buy a camel you enquire the price, offer half of what you intend to pay, spit, walk away, and come back after lunch. It is, we are assured, quite essential to spit. Also when I was young I was told a story about the difference between a diplomat and a lady. If he said 'Yes' he meant perhaps, and if he said 'No' he was no diplomat.

That is all I know about diplomacy. So I do not know what is the diplomatic significance of the latest Note delivered in triplicate to the Kremlin by America, Britain and France. What the Note says is that these Great and ex-Great Powers are prepared to have four-power talks provided the Russians first agreed to free elections in the whole of Germany, and to the signing of an Austrian Peace Treaty.

These of course would not be political concessions but military ones. They would mean allowing the Germans to vote the American Army and radar screen right up to their eastern frontiers, and abandoning a key strategic position in Austria.

Of course nothing is impossible. It is possible that the Russians might be less concerned than we think about the military set-up. Certainly if they have been reading western press reports of their strength and western weakness they might feel reassured. They might laugh and say that if this is to be a diplomatic chess game we will start by giving you a rook and a knight.

Such a reaction is highly unlikely, particularly since the terms of the Note appear to suggest that the Western Powers do not desire a settlement at present and that they therefore lay down impossible preliminary conditions for a conference. There is just the chance, however, that they have been listening to the expert camel-buyer, that they are willing to come to terms, that they are going through the motions of stating an impossible price, and that they fully intend to come back after lunch and clinch the deal.

We in the Labour movement cannot discuss these problems in such terms when nothing less than the survival of humanity is at

stake. Diplomatic niceties, chess board manoeuvres and military sand-table exercises are not only trivial but dangerous when neither diplomats nor generals understand neither what their own political objective is, nor what makes their opponents tick.

The Labour Party is now moving towards the closing stages of a policy struggle on the subject of German rearmament. Most of the arguments being deployed in favour of a German 'contribution' are concerned with military security. Equally forcible arguments can be brought forward on similar grounds to show the complete unreliability of Western Germany as a military ally, and the immense dangers of unleashing a world war through some apparently spontaneous and accidental act of German irredentism. Furthermore, a German manpower contribution could only be of substantial significance if it were maintained and equipped from outside. Put more crudely, during the last war the Germans put 300 divisions in the field against the Russians, backed up by the industrial and conscripted manpower resources of the whole of Europe, and still failed to beat them.

At the moment it seems that the flash point dangers of starting a new war are in the Far East. If we fail to ensure a will to peace there it may be that disaster will be upon us before a German army is available, even with the thorough preliminary work already done by the Adenauer government.

This does not mean that the issue of German rearmament has ceased to be the most important issue at the Scarborough Conference. On the contrary it means that if the Labour Party contrives to express its true feelings and instincts there, it can bring a fresh impetus of public opinion to influence the British Government towards an independent foreign policy. It will also have found its own soul again.

Most important still it will have called back into play political forces in Europe which have been suppressed, neutralised and demoralised in the last few years.

The struggle over E.D.C. is over, and we have won. It is still not generally realised in Britain, however, that the strongest opposition to that device among the left in French politics was not the surrender of military sovereignty and the crippling and humiliating machinery of the treaty. It was the fact that the French were being pushed away from their natural friends into a political association permanently reactionary and electorally weighed against the left. Let us also always remember that the last war was a civil war in

every country in Europe except Britain. Those who fought in the Resistance can now observe with bitterness that their fellow citizens who never feared a visit from the Gestapo during the occupation are steadily climbing back into power and favour.

When Mr. Eden is attacked as a Communist stooge for his attitude at Geneva, and when Mr. Attlee is howled at as a rat and a tool of the Reds it is time to pause and consider what is happening in the great political alignments which reactionary vested interests are using in the world to defend themselves against inevitable social changes.

It is not really the numbers or efficiency of German and Spanish mercenaries that are attractive to our allies. It is the fact that Britain and France are being written off as politically unreliable.

What we need to do in the Labour movement now is to make it clear where we stand in world politics. We are not prepared to act as policemen against social changes which we regard as inevitable and against subject peoples with whose aspirations we sympathise. There are a number of things which we can be relied upon to do and those who do not like them must make their dispositions accordingly. Any form of military alliance with Germany except through the United Nations is a menace to peace and an encouragement to political reaction, and we will have none of it. Any insistence on German rearmament now will have its bad effect long before that rearmament is completed. It will appear as a symbolic alignment with those who do not desire to use the present favourable opportunity for the relaxation of tension. We should show more sympathy with the view of the German Social Democratic Party that reunification of Germany is the most important first step towards the peace of Europe. We should work to achieve this without one-sided military alliances and within the framework of an all-Europe security system. It does not matter who said this first, whether it was Mr. Malenkov or M. Daladier or anyone else. Nor do the precise details matter. What matters is that there is sufficient general desire for a solution on these lines to make it certain that if the Four Powers went into a conference with a preliminary agreement to agree, confident that the main issues could be happily concluded and yet quite prepared to bargain vigorously over details and minor issues, then success is certain, and peace is saved.

That success is certain does not mean that it is instantaneous. The first and most important step is to secure the halting of German rearmament simultaneously with the unification of Germany through

free elections in East and West. The next step must be a Peace Treaty with the United Germany confirming her present frontiers. This would permit the inclusion of all ex-enemy states in the United Nations as free and equal members. U.N.O. would by then have begun to switch its attention from military security to peaceful reconstruction and development. Each nation, ex-enemy or otherwise, could undertake economic and financial responsibilities for development of lands according to its resources, and without loss of national self-respect. At that stage the climate of world opinion would be favourable on relaxed and commonsense grounds for a general convention for the reduction of armaments. Support for such an inspiring programme will make political unity of the Labour movement a spontaneous and natural process.

CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS NUMBERS IN 1954

JANUARY: *Outlook for 1954*, R.P.D.; *The Italian Socialist Party and the Policy of Unity of the Masses*, Pietro Nenni; *A Common Policy for Labour*, Harry Pollitt; *Wages: The Next Step*, J. R. Scott; *The Real Terrorists in Kenya*, Monica Whately; *Bias in Political Economy*, R. L. Meek. **BOOK REVIEW:** *Ancient History of Western Asia, India and Crete* (Bedrich Hrozný), Robert Browning.

FEBRUARY: *From Cold War to What?* R.P.D.; *France Moves*, Jacques Duclos; *Prospects in Berlin*, Gordon Schaffer; *Wage Movement Lessons*, J. R. Campbell; *Kashmir*, Edward Burton; *I. G. Farben Ueber Alles?* D. N. Pritt, Q.C. **BOOK REVIEWS:** *Selected Articles and Speeches* (Harry Pollitt); *Works*, Vol. II (J. V. Stalin); *The Game of Death* (A. E. Kahn); *The Water Tower* (André Stül); *Wages, Prices and Social Legislation in the Soviet Union* (Lief Björk); reviewed by R. Stewart, H. B. Lim, M. Davies, D. Michaelson, H.C.C.

MARCH: *They First Make Mad*, R.P.D.; *Tactics in the Wage Fight*, Peter Kerrigan; *Trying to Save Europe*, Quæstor; *How the Poor Relieve the Rich*, Katherine Hood; *Towards an Economic Crisis in the U.S.A.*, Eugene Varga; *Portrait of a Ruling Class*, Monica Felton. **BOOK REVIEWS:** *Marx and Engels on Malthus* (R. L. Meek); *Rising Tide* (Jack Lindsay); reviewed by M.H.D., Ted Dickens.

APRIL: *The Party of Victory*, R.P.D.; *The Political Scene*, John Gollan; *Making Peace*, Ivor Montagu; *Empire and the Peoples*, Ben Bradley; *Atomic Guns—or Atomic Butter?* Cmdr. E. P. Young, R.N. (Ret'd.); *The Voice That Breathed O'er Eden*, R. Page Arnot. **BOOK REVIEWS:** *Scottish Charism* (L. C. Wright); *Your Children's Future* (M. Morris); *Intelligence Testing and the Comprehensive School* (Brian Simon); *Russia and the Weimar Republic* (L. Kochan); reviewed by John Saville, G. C. T. Giles, Pat Sloan.

MAY: *The Bomb*, R.P.D.; *Problems of Organised Labour in the U.S.*, Wm. Z. Foster; *World Security at Geneva*, Quæstor; *Labour Parties Protest Against Rearming Germany*. **BOOK REVIEWS:** *Selected Works*, Vol. I (Mao Tse-tung); *A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire* (Mao Tse-tung); *Who Controls West German Industry?* (L.R.D.); *West Germany Prepares War of Revenge* (Committee for German Unity); reviewed by B. Farrington, I. Montagu, M.M.

JUNE: *In the Balance*, R.P.D.; *Canada and the U.S.*, Python, Tim Buck; *Steps Towards Unity*, George Matthews; *War or Peace in South-East Asia*, Gordon Schaffer; *The World of Mr. Attlee*, D. N. Pritt, Q.C. **BOOK REVIEWS:** *The British Political System* (J. Gollan); *Government and Parliament* (H. Morrison); *Science and Industry in the Nineteenth Century* (J. D. Bernal, F.R.S.); *The Tyrants' Might is Passing* (W. Gallacher); reviewed by K. Hood, W. C. Stevens, W. Lauchlan.

JULY: *Forty Years On*, R.P.D.; *Geneva*, Quæstor; *The Engineers' Pay*, H. Howarth; *Unpublished Lenin Documents: Guatemala*, A. Boyd; *New Magazines and All That*, H. Smith; *Negro History*, W. Gallacher. **BOOK REVIEW:** *Claude Helvetius* (I. L. Horowitz); reviewed by E. J. Hobbsbawn.

AUGUST: *War or Peace?* R. Page Arnot; *Are Wages High Enough?* J. Gardner; *Must Britain be a Satellite?* Quæstor; *A Voice from Guatemala*, Guillermo Toriello; *Disciples of Hitler*, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; *'In the Wings'*, J. D. L. Nicholson; *The Ethnology of Indo-China*, Marcel Ner. **BOOK REVIEWS:** *Articles and Speeches*, Vol. II (Harry Pollitt); *William Thompson* (R. K. P. Pankhurst); *Dialectical Materialism*, Vol. II (M. Cornforth); *Through the Chinese Revolution* (R. and N. Lapwood); *The Last Illusion* (H. D. Meycr); *Good To Be Alive* (S. Harrison); reviewed by P. Kerrigan, R. L. Meek, C. P. Dutt, Nowell Johnson, P. Bolsover, R. Malcolm.

SEPTEMBER: *New Horizons*, R.P.D.; *Germany and Europe*, Dr. Joseph Wirth; *Labour Party Boomerang*, E. M. Winterton; *Goa: A Reply on the First International*, Karl Marx; *A Visit to Charlie Chaplin*, S. Gerasimov. **BOOK REVIEWS:** *Alexander Somerville* (E. J. Carswell); *The Sun Shines Over the Sangkan River* (Ting Ling); *A People Reborn* (Editor, Andrew Rothstein); *Plain Perfidy* (A. Winnington and W. Burchett); *Quest for Life* (S. Mahmuduzzafar); *Marginal Land in Britain* (W. Ellison); *Students* (Yuri Trifonov), reviewed by J. Saville, M. Pollitt, Rev. S. Evans, T. McW., B. Bradley, J.D., M. Johnstone.

THE END OF E.D.C.

EDOUARD HERRIOT

[For the interest our our readers, we print a translation of the speech of the veteran Radical-Socialist Edouard Herriot which preceded the rejection of E.D.C. by the French Parliament. Herriot, Premier of France in 1924, and Honorary President of the French National Assembly, made this speech in moving the previous question. In view of his great age, Herriot spoke from his chair. It was eight years since he had last addressed the Assembly.—Ed., L.M.]*

I NEED hardly say in intervening—not without emotion—in this debate, that I will do everything to maintain its serenity and its solemnity. I speak today in support of the previous question because it is the only means for us, the opponents of the treaty, to express our opinion for the last time.

The debate could, after all, be a very simple one. Parliament has posed what are called ‘preliminaries’. The first question is whether these are fulfilled. For why should a great Assembly like ours formulate reservations only to throw them overboard later on or to consider them as a mockery or a mere demonstration aimed at outsiders? At least two such ‘preliminaries’ have been sacrificed: First, the Saar ‘preliminary’ about which there are conversations at the moment—but these are family secrets that we do not know; and second, the English ‘preliminary’. I have sought out, I have read with anguish the documents. However amiable, flattering and encouraging these declarations Britain is not engaged on our side, in this matter. Of this we may say without exaggeration that to resist the power and the eventual manoeuvres of Germany, it would not be too much to have a close understanding, with the same risks and the same responsibilities, between the United Kingdom and France. This lack of solidarity between France and Great Britain is reason by itself which would make me reject the E.D.C., because, in the diplomatic history of our country, it is an innovation which I believe to be very dangerous and which I, for my part, do not approve.

Alas! we have many other reasons for being hostile to E.D.C. The principal reason is the diminution of our country’s sovereignty

*Article 46 of the Standing Orders of the French National Assembly stipulates: the previous question (*question préalable*) aims at deciding that there is no debate needed: its adoption means the final rejection of the text under discussion.

and independence. Allow me to be specially firm on this point, for at my age, the views expressed by me reflect the deepest feeling and the dearest wishes of all my national conscience.

The E.D.C. Treaty would mean for Germany a leap forward towards its sovereignty and for France a jump backwards with regard to its own independence and its own sovereignty. I understand that to bring about European progress, that is, human progress, all nations must make sacrifices. The hour demands a new effort. But take heed! The condition is that this effort be made by all the nations of Europe and not by only one or two nations, including ours. Reading the E.D.C. Treaty and the noble and serious speech of the President of the Council (M. Mendès-France), here are my conclusions. What are the encroachments on her sovereignty for France? I mention only the most important. Firstly, her army is cut in two—nobody can deny this. Secondly, the length of national service is not fixed by our national parliament. Thirdly, the general budget of the armies is fixed by a unanimous vote of the E.D.C. Council, and then allocated: this means that control over about one quarter of French expenditure is taken out of the hands of Parliament. Fourthly, army pay is fixed by the Commissioners. Fifthly, our generals are no longer appointed by the President of the French Republic: and mobilisation no longer depends upon us.

I ask you, when a people loses the control of its army, does it retain the control of its diplomacy? For my part, the answer is no. It does not retain it, and this is particularly serious at an epoch like ours when diplomatic questions have such an acute character. For however much of an idealist you are, you cannot ignore that the strength of a country is an active, if not a decisive, factor wherever her diplomacy is at stake.

These are the shackles imposed on France. If you have any doubt of their grave and humiliating character for our country, I refer you to Article 20 of the Treaty which confirms them all. There it is written:

In the carrying out of their duties the members of the Commission are neither to ask for nor accept instructions from any government. They are to abstain from any action incompatible with the supra-national character of their functions.

The Commissioners are thus completely cut off from any link with their country.

This wording is both monstrous and ridiculous. Monstrous; for what true Frenchman would agree to represent his country without

trying to serve it? Ridiculous; for it puts a premium on disloyalty. What sort of men would be these Commissioners who would have repudiated their national origin? Beings not of flesh and bone, superhuman beings, a kind of robot, by whom we would be commanded, governed, directed. Article 20 is the confirmation of the humiliation of France, and for my part I do not accept it.

M. Herriot was here interrupted by M. Teitgen of the M.R.P., a supporter of E.D.C., who repeated arguments for a repeated approach to the Germans. M. Herriot continued:

Do you by any chance think I am ignorant enough or stupid enough to want to cross Germany off the map? As a matter of fact, I have been in touch with Germans all my life. Many of them I respect. I even think I know a little of Chancellor Adenauer. I believe his mind readily turns to evangelism. But this is not the question.

I would have said this even without Mr. Teitgen's interruption: we want a pacified Europe, we want a place for Germany in it, as we want a place for Russia in it. Yes! I need not remind my old colleagues in Parliament that it was I who, in 1924, opened diplomatic relations with the Soviets. I did this, ladies and gentlemen, when conditions were much more difficult than today, when the walls of France were covered with posters showing the bolshevik with a knife between his teeth. I did it when, in the French bourgeoisie and elsewhere, there was deep resentment at the non-payment on the Russian bonds. But I did it: and I do not regret it. For, let me declare to this National Assembly, and grave it on its memory, from the day when I did it, I never had the slightest difficulty with Russia.

Interruptions

There is talk of leases, amendments, protocols. It is better to tell the truth. The conflict is not about the form but about the heart of the matter. For us—allow me to say it as I think it at the end of my life, as an epitome of all my life's endeavours—for me, for us, the European Defence Community is the end of France. If France had to deal with a country which had not several times cheated us, then this might not be the end of France. But we have known and undergone on the part of this country such departures from what is right that I am compelled to say to you something. I, who am an old man—one foot in the grave—must say, not in a threatening way, but from the bottom of my heart: 'Take care that you don't live to regret an act which you would be unable to alter, unable to undo.'

Since we differ on the heart of the problem, it is better to dispose of it immediately, to cut this abcess out of French politics. You are sincere, I know, but alas! we are older than you, we have seen many things. For us, the question is not one of detail, it is not a question of a change of a comma. For us it is the question of life or death for France.

I may be told: if you do not want E.D.C., you do not want a Europe. I protest against such a conclusion. You have no right to say this to the man who in 1924 proposed to the nations the Protocol of Geneva. But here lies, I think, the heart of the matter. You see, my dear colleagues, you will not find peace when you seek it on the road to war.

We do not want a solution of the problem through armament, rearmament, super-armament: we want a solution for a united Europe, for the whole of Europe, and not for a Europe of five or six nations.

We want peace through peace itself, not through the rearmament of certain countries. On the other hand, we have a treaty with Russia, which to a certain extent is binding upon us. And if I am told, 'we know you, you want an alliance with Russia', my answer is, 'I no longer want anything, at my age, except to see my country set on the road that will bring it to a degree of happiness'. But I do not see why we should not seek peaceful relations, an agreement and co-operation with those who already helped us in our tragic hours and of whom we need only ask a clearer statement of their intentions and a more definite offer of their collaboration.

Mesdames, Messieurs, I will add some arguments which I believe essential. One is drawn from Article 11 of the Treaty where it is laid down that Germany will be authorised to set up a police and an armed constabulary. I have several times pointed out the danger of this Article; I have never been listened to. But who is there does not see the peril that could arise were Germany to be permitted to raise a supplementary army of one hundred thousand or of two hundred thousand men? I say this with a strong conviction because it is the problem which confronted the Doumergue ministry at the moment when Hitler was offering certain concessions to France if he was granted this reserve army. Read this Article, it provides that this stipulation is an internal question for Germany and which does not allow for the intervention of the co-signatory Powers. If in consequence you see tomorrow the reconstitution of the Gestapo and the S.S., do not be astonished.

I do not forget that if there were in the German army certain traces of honour, at any rate of professional honour, nevertheless, in its occupation of France this army was accompanied by out and out butchers who massacred our brothers—this I will not forget. I cannot but agree with General Koenig's report that this E.D.C. army will not be worth anything, because an army is not a collection of regimental numbers. An army must have a soul.

What is a country's army? It is not the mathematical summing-up of its conscripts. It is the country ranged around its banner for the defence of its material and intellectual treasures, for the defence of its liberty and its independence. It is because these feelings, developed by the French Revolution, had such depth and intensity in our country that they gave to the men of the Marne courage to die under conditions we must never forget. The army is the soul of the country and I should like to know where this E.D.C. army will get a soul. Certainly the attempt will be made to prepare it by formularies. But what can formularies do compared to the deep influence of patriotic and national ideas implanted in our countries by the centuries of the past. If you have a war—and you know against whom this would be—please ask yourself what will be the influence of these formularies upon our soldiers compared to the attraction of other doctrines with which they will be in contact—doctrines which German propaganda will scarcely be able to gainsay. . . .

Lastly, I should like to say something to our American friends, as a man who has proved his independence to them.

I am very much struck by the similarity between the present period and the period after the first world war. On the morrow of that war, the United States refused to ratify a treaty for the sake of which Foch and Clemenceau had made them numerous concessions. The consequent draft treaties between France and England, and between France and America, were without effect. Then came the London Conference. There, though a party to the treaty, the Americans turned up and put the pressure on us to get the Dawes Plan and the evacuation of the Ruhr. . . . Later, charging back again, the Americans imposed on us the Young Plan (which rid Germany of obligations which bore her signature). Then, as if this were not enough, they imposed on us the Hoover moratorium. Thus it was that we arrived—I was one of them—empty-handed at the Conference of Lausanne.

And the first time that I met Chancellor Von Papen (in the course of a courtesy visit), do you know what he proposed to me as the

On the Fifth Anniversary of the



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chinese People's Republic . . .



Lino engravings by GEOFF. MILLER

only thing worth talking about? A plan of common attack on the Russians: Frenchmen and Germans directed against the Slavs. Naturally, I would not stand for it.

I would rather have the guarantee of four-power agreements, than the Six-Nations-Europe compromise which I am convinced would entail the worst complications and which the French will regret having signed. It is not possible to determine in this way the fate of our country for 50 years ahead. I say it once more, I prefer the present situation with the four-power agreements, until such time as a better building can be erected. I remind you of Clemenceau's words shortly before his death: 'Frenchmen, do not forget that even a great country can disappear'.

I do not want E.D.C.; I want a rapprochement with Germany, with all European countries, based on other principles. I will not by any means agree to let my country go through a period of uncertainty and trouble, of lying and treason perhaps. Do not take a leap in the dark.

400

This is the four hundredth number of LABOUR MONTHLY. Thirty-three and a third years have passed since LABOUR MONTHLY was founded to forward Labour unity.

In this 400th number we deal with the burning issues of war or peace that come up in the debate at the Labour Party Conference.

This month is also the 200th anniversary of Henry Fielding; an article on him will be printed in November. Also in November George Pefkos will write on Enosis—Cyprus' road to freedom.

TRADE UNIONS ON THE MARCH

W. C. STEVENS*

THE 1954 Congress at Brighton may well prove to have marked a turning point in the general policy of the British Trade Union Movement. The delegates, by overturning the General Council policy on a number of important issues and in recording substantial minority votes on others, appear to me to be expressing not only the awareness of the important issues at stake but their increasing dissatisfaction with the manner in which the General Council attempts to ride rough-shod over both the feelings of the delegates and the principles of procedure in Congress business. In the past the manoeuvres of the right wing of the General Council have too often been allowed to pass almost unchallenged, and whilst this year on a number of occasions these manoeuvres were successful, on others Congress challenged the tactics and defeated them. The order of business on Congress Agenda, together with its extremely poor handling by the Chairman—Jack Tanner—left much to be desired, with the result that such important items of policy as Wages, East-West trade, further nationalisation and Colonial exploitation, among other subjects, were debated on Friday morning with the press tables depleted and the opportunity for full discussion extremely limited. Despite all these things the voting at Congress on vital international and domestic policies must be regarded as an increasing contribution towards peace and higher living standards. Significant too was the tenor of the remarks from the two fraternal delegates from Canada and the U.S.A. Unlike their predecessors, who in recent years have devoted their speeches almost wholly to attacks on the Soviet Union, these delegates, particularly the one from Canada, drew the applause of Congress in his emphasis on the need to fight to overcome the effects of world capitalism on the workers.

In the most important international debate the death knell of German rearmament, as far as the Labour movement in Britain is concerned, was sounded in the vote of Congress. It is true that the ambiguous emergency resolution which signified the uncertainty of the General Council, was carried by a small majority, but there was no doubt in the mind of nearly every delegate that it would have been

*Mr. Stevens, as many of our readers will know, is General Secretary of the Electrical Trades Union.

decisively defeated had it not been for a difficult to understand decision of the Miners' delegation to support it. Despite all the manoeuvres that were adopted in the timing of the debate and the fact that four members of the General Council went to the rostrum in support of Sir Vincent Tewson's abject statement, the result was a moral victory for sanity and peace. Delegates had heard in a strained, tense silence the contribution of the representative of the Jewish Bakers' Union, the smallest Union affiliated to Congress. His appeal was an emotional one but was founded on historical fact and should damn for ever the protagonists who would now set again in motion the German military machine under its former Nazi military and financial bosses. There is no doubt that on this vital issue the British workers are becoming more and more mobilised and coherent in their opposition to any steps that would inevitably plunge humanity into another holocaust. Jim Campbell of the Railwaymen and John Horner for the Firemen assisted ably in demolishing the façade of argument which Vincent Tewson laboriously attempted to build up. In my opinion there could be no more welcome or healthy sign than the minority vote on this occasion, and it will undoubtedly cause some heart and conscience searching to be done both in the General Council and among the Labour Party Executive and Parliamentary Section.

On another international issue of extreme importance, occurred an example of how the obscuring of an issue can create doubts and lead to confusion among the delegates. My Union, as is common practice, had forwarded to the General Council in June a motion passed at our Policy Conference in May asking for an attempt to be made to secure discussions between the two Trade Union Internationals, the I.C.F.T.U. (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) and the W.F.T.U. (World Federation of Trade Unions). We felt that such steps could and should be taken in order to see if it was not possible to secure better relationships than have previously existed. The General Council in reply to our request issued a supplementary statement to its own report rejecting any possibility of such a step. It was also decided that a composite motion supported by the Amalgamated Engineering Union and the National Union of Railwaymen and an amendment supported by the National Union of Public Employees and the Tobacco Workers' Union urging similar steps to those we had requested, should themselves be treated as amendments to the General Council's supplementary statement.

Arthur Deakin, in supporting the supplementary statement, launched once again into his familiar hysterical tirade against the W.F.T.U. In a speech devoid of one iota of logic he attacked the suggestion of closer international unity, using as one of his arguments the specious plea that if the General Council did anything as was suggested, it would be breaking the Constitution of the I.C.F.T.U. If the I.C.F.T.U. Constitution does not *compel* it to seek the closest co-operation with all representative Trade Union organisations, then there is something radically wrong with that Constitution and the General Council should be doing something about amending it!

No mention of the economic demands that must be a fundamental basis for a T.U. International was made by the General Council—one would have thought that far from safeguarding and advancing the standards of living of its affiliated members, the I.C.F.T.U. existed solely to wage an ideological battle with the other great international, and I wonder sometimes whether that is not really the intention of those who persistently refuse any united action and often attempt to justify or play down the oppressive policies of employers as, for instance, the United Fruit Company in Guatemala.

That the intention of the motion had been obscured was reflected in its defeat by a majority of over four million, but the fact that delegates had been confused was apparent when, at a later stage of conference, the reference back of a section of the Report, in which the General Council had abruptly rejected an invitation to visit the Soviet Trade Unions in Russia, was only defeated by one million votes—a clear indication that the workers are rapidly becoming aware that the surest way of promoting friendship and understanding and dispelling the clouds on the cold war front lies in an extension and development of fraternal relations with the workers of *all* countries.

The developing criticism of the General Council's lack of correct leadership was again evidenced in the debates on Retirement and the Housing Repairs and Rents Act. For some reason known only to the General Council and certainly not made clear to Congress by Miss Anne Godwin who spoke for the Council, the leaders of the T.U.C. decided to oppose a movement by the A.E.S.D. to refer back a report which implied that workers should no longer expect to be able to retire at the latest by 65 years of age. Jim Mortimer said that his Union agreed that, subject to certain safeguards, workers should have the right to work to a later age if they wished

but it felt strongly that the principle of retirement at 65 and the right of workers to expect retirement at that age should not be sacrificed. Congress agreed with him and rejected the General Council's policy by over two and a quarter million votes.

A demand led by the Foundry Workers with a powerful plea from Archie McDougall, for a campaign for the repeal of the Robber Rent Act was also opposed by the General Council who asked that the motion should be remitted to it. In asking this the General Council's spokesman made it quite obvious that there was no intention to secure even drastic modification much less its repeal, and in the light of its uncompromising statement the Foundry Workers refused to remit the motion. A card vote resulted in a further defeat of the General Council's puerile attitude by over a million votes.

My own Union asked Congress to reject any form of wage restraint and support any efforts to improve living standards. Although this was rejected over three million votes were cast in favour. The opposition being unable to find arguments against the logic of the motion, resorted to unjustifiable interpretation of words to obtain the majority against decision.

In the closing stages of Congress unanimous agreement was reached on the necessity to proceed with the nationalisation of further basic industries, and the urgency of developing and extending international trade.

In contrast to the rather disheartening role played by the Miners' delegation throughout the week, was a firm declaration of opposition to further exploitation of the colonial peoples. This debate was marked by a brilliant contribution from Arthur Horner, the Miners' Secretary, in which he tore to shreds Mr. Arthur Deakin's attempts to cloud the issue with his usual 'Red Herring' tactics.

Whilst warning against any undue complacency developing from the 1954 Trades Union Congress, I believe it is the forerunner of a more progressive policy by the Trade Union and Labour movement on both domestic and international questions.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; \$3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada (\$3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL: *To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy 4s. 6d.; a year's subscription 54s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy 5s.; a year's subscription 60s. To Aden, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq and Syria, post free, 4s. per copy; a year's subscription 48s.

TAI-WAN AND MANILA

R. PAGE ARNOT

ALL who remember how John Foster Dulles turned up in the middle of June, 1950, to give encouragement to Syngman Rhee's troops and to assure them of his support just a few days before they launched their attack on the Korean People's Republic must have been struck by the sinister parallel of the Dulles visit to Chiang Kai-shek in the second week of September. The wording of the foreign news telegram of September 9 was ominous:

Mr. Dulles conferred with General Chiang Kai-shek during a brief visit to Formosa today, before flying on to Tokyo. They talked as Nationalist aircraft and warships from the island bombarded the port of Amoy for the third day. . . .

Mr. Dulles said on arrival that the United States was standing by Nationalist China against 'aggression'.

(The Times, September 10, 1954.)

These 'Nationalist aircraft and warships' bombarding the great Chinese port of Amoy (and also bombing British merchant ships) are supplied by the United States, are backed by the force of the United States' navy and have now had the special encouragement of a visit from Mr. Dulles in person, whose open war-mongering and Hitlerite use of 'the big lie' are coolly recorded in the British papers as though they were minor news-items. The conclusion at Manila of the eight-power pact, designed by Dulles to involve Britain in a U.S. war against the peoples of South-East Asia received only passing comment in the British press. The danger to world peace of re-arming the Nazis is recognised and discussed: the danger of the complementary war plans of the United States in Asia does not rouse a similar public discussion. But world peace is indivisible, and those whose sons were sent to die in Korea may well be apprehensive when they read the news of Manila and of the bombardment of Amoy with napalm hurled down, day after day, to burn alive men, women and children.

It is seven and a half years since the announcement of the Truman Doctrine by which United States capitalism, swollen with the belief in its monopoly of the atom bomb, launched its plan for world domination under the guise of a proclaimed attack on Communism in any and every country. It is five years this October since the proclamation of the Chinese People's Republic, following on the overwhelming defeat of the U.S.-supported forces of Chiang Kai-

shek, spoiled the plans to use China along with a re-armed Japan as the East Asian war base against the Soviet Union. There still remained from October, 1949, some areas of China from which in the course of the next months the People's Liberation Army was dislodging the American forces and liberating people from the grasp of imperialism. Amongst these were Hainan island whose liberation in the spring of 1950 was to be followed by the liberation of the island of Tai-wan (or Formosa). Temporarily stunned by this setback to its plans of encirclement, the U.S. government declared that it would no longer interfere in Chinese affairs. The White Paper of August, 1949, recalled that:

By the terms of the Cairo declaration on December 1, 1943, the United States and China declared their intention that Formosa should be restored to it. . . . During the Japanese occupation the principal hope of the people had been reunion with the mainland.

Four months later on December 23, 1949, the State Department declared:

Formosa, politically, geographically, and strategically is part of China in no way especially distinguished or important. . . . Seeking United States bases on Formosa, sending in troops, supplying arms, dispatching navy units, or taking any similar action would involve the United States in a long-time venture producing at best a new area of bristling stalemate, and at worst possible involvement in open warfare.

This standpoint was maintained in the early spring of 1950 as far as the U.S. government was concerned. It was in accordance with international law.

But in that same spring and early summer of 1950 there was brewing the conspiracy between the China Lobby, Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee and General Douglas MacArthur and other generals in the U.S. war office for a full resumption of plans for aggression in Asia. Of this, which may be called the Pentagon Plot—the U.S. being now the most militaristic country in the world—a warning was given by Agnes Smedley in an article written on her death-bed and published in the *Labour Monthly* of July, 1950. The plot matured during June, 1950, and in the last week of that month the attack was launched on Korea, followed by the United Nations' illegal decision which involved Britain and other countries in that disgraceful war. By the autumn of 1950 the frontiers of China were endangered and armies of Chinese volunteers came to assist the people of Korea. So effective was the resistance that it was possible for a cease-fire to be proposed to either side by the U.S.S.R. in June, 1951, and an armistice to be reached in summer, 1953.

The attack was three-pronged. It was in Korea, in Indo-China (in which the U.S. was providing the main munitions of war in the last four years) and from Tai-wan (or Formosa). The forces of peace brought about the armistice in Korea, and then, this last summer, the cease-fire in Indo-China, through the Geneva Conference; but the third means of attack against the Chinese people still remains in the American occupation of Tai-wan. For in the same week of June, 1950, that the U.S.-inspired attack was launched in Korea, President Truman announced the aggression of the U.S. fleet on the Chinese island of Tai-wan to which the forces of Chiang Kai-shek had finally retreated. This act of aggression was so blatant as to perturb the satellites of the U.S.A. as was shown at the time by the comment in their magazines and periodicals. For example:

If war begins between China and the United States on the issue of Formosa, the aggressor will not be the Communists.

(*New Statesman and Nation*, August 12, 1950.)

And again in the same issue:

Even a paper as deeply concerned to avoid criticising America as the *Observer* has now bluntly and courageously pointed out that, whatever view may be taken of the legal position of Formosa, there can be no doubt that Mao Tse-tung would be justified in attacking the island if it is used as a base of military operations by Chiang Kai-shek. . . . There is no country where it is not assumed that Mao must round off his revolutionary victory by finally clearing out the rump of the Kuomintang from Formosa.

As for the 'legal position' the U.S. Secretary of State had himself only six months earlier in January, 1950, declared any such point to be a 'legal quibble'.

The *New Statesman and Nation* of 1950 has been quoted because six weeks ago that journal joined in a disingenuous attempt to show that China has no right to the island of Tai-wan, as though Britain had no right to the Isle of Wight. *The Economist*, on the ground that Chiang Kai-shek 'cannot be dislodged except by the defeat of the United States in war' (August 21, 1954) recommended that might should be regarded as right and that the U.S. aggression should be winked at. *The Times* in a rambling inconsequent manner went into history, suggested that Tai-wan had only been Chinese for three centuries (*i.e.*, since long before there was any United States of America) and that with the overthrow of the Ming dynasty in the time of the English civil war 'Tai-wan became the last refuge of Chinese resistance', etc., etc., etc. In the same way but under other conditions a far eastern *Times* might have argued in an even more rambling way for a continued Japanese occupation of the Isle of Wight. ('The Isle of Wight, colonised long ago by the Jutes, who

long retained their Jutish outlook as distinct from the Angles and Saxons of the mainland, was often the resort of poets and princes. But though the Guelph or Wettin dynasty in the person of Queen Victoria made residence there, its un-English nature was recognised by her successor who promptly handed over the royal residence to be a naval hospital, etc., etc., etc.'). But the *New Statesman and Nation*, more indelicate than *The Times*, turned somersault with all its petticoats in the air, and with a shrill scream compared any Chinese liberation of Formosa to Hitler's occupation of Prague.

Why, even the *Economist*, though coming out in its conclusion against the Churchill policy, admitted the facts earlier in its article:

The United States is clearly in a weak position internationally on this issue. The American protection for the island was given unilaterally; it has never had either the support of Britain or any kind of endorsement from the United Nations. Today, not only is Britain, having recognised the Communist régime as the *de jure* government of China, legally precluded in any case from joining in a guarantee to Formosa, but British opinion is almost entirely sympathetic to Peking's case on this question. Indeed, there is no issue on which America might be involved in a war crisis with less moral or political support from London.

(August 21, 1954.)

It is not enough for Mr. Attlee (at his press conference in New Zealand on September 14) to say of the U.S. Seventh Fleet activities around Formosa

I disapprove of the action but that is a matter for the United States.

It is a matter for us and for the whole world. It is not a private affair of the United States. Peace is endangered. Therefore we must demand that this be stopped and stopped at once. It is the duty of the British Government to raise the matter in the United Nations and to demand the immediate withdrawal of the Seventh Fleet from Chinese waters.

We have to reckon that the militaristic circles of the United States, raging against the victory of peace and the defeat of the war-mongers at Geneva, have by no means acquiesced in the set-back to their plans. More than before they are backing Chiang Kai-shek, striving for the revival of a Japanese militarism and building up at Manila their military alliance 'against aggression in South-East Asia'.

Their aggression in Tai-wan may lead to large-scale war as it is already responsible for Chiang Kai-shek's American bombers murdering men, women and children. Their long-term plans for Japan are exactly complementary to their plans for re-arming the Nazis. Their success in involving Britain and France, along with their Anzus subordinates and their litter of local tyrants in Siam,

Pakistan and the Philippines, in the Manila treaty, is not only a deliberate attempt to upset the agreement on the restoration of peace in Indo-China but an additional threat to the peace of the world. The three states of former French Indo-China were 'designated', *i.e.*, were named as areas where a people's victory in the elections set for 1955 and 1956 could at a word from Bao-Dai be regarded as 'communism' and the sons of Britain sent out 'to die for Bao-Dai'. If it were not for the standpoint expressed in leading countries of Asia (apart from China and other people's democracies), the U.S. scheme for Manila would have been even worse. But the Indian government has objected most strongly to the eight-power pact as a pact of imperialism: while Mrs. Pandit, Chairman of the Eighth Assembly of the United Nations, forthrightly declared in the capital of Indonesia:

The seating of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and the return of Tai-wan to China would help to ease world tension. She pointed out that the island of Tai-wan is part of the People's Republic of China which should have its place in the United Nations.

(Press conference in Djakarta, August 22, 1954.)

The liberation of Tai-wan, necessary for the territorial integrity of China, would relax the war tension, which as things are may flare up at any moment into large-scale war. For this, as for the refusal by parliament to ratify this anti-Asian Manila treaty of Mr. Dulles, the labour movement and the supporters of peace have to bend their efforts. These are the immediate steps. But more still will be needed. For the events of these last weeks and months have made it all too plain that there will never be settled peace in the Far East until the United States have been cleared bag and baggage out of Asia.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

ALWAYS FOR PEACE

Soviet Russia's ceaseless struggle for peace began literally on the morrow of the victorious proletarian revolution. It was on November 8, 1917, that the All-Russian Congress of Soviets unanimously adopted the famous Decree of Peace. That decree proposed 'to all warring peoples and their Governments to begin immediately negotiations for a just and democratic peace'. . . . That call for unity, in the struggle for peace, from the working class of Russia to the working class of the capitalist world has remained throughout the natural *leit-motiv* of the foreign policy of the Workers' Republic.

From *Soviet Russia's Fight for Peace*, by G. A. Hutt, October, 1929.

CHINA AND TIBET

THE DALAI LAMA

[In contrast to newspaper legends about Tibet, we print the full text of the speech made by the Dalai Lama at a banquet given by Chu Teh, Vice-Chairman of the Central People's Government, on September 5, 1954.—Ed., L.M.]

Vice-Chairman Chu Teh, Premier Chou En-lai, leaders of the Central People's Government, and ladies and gentlemen:

The first session of the first National People's Congress will soon be held in Peking—the capital of the motherland. This is a great and auspicious event for the people of the whole country. Coming from the remote border region of Tibet, I and Panchen Ngoerhleh, as well as other deputies and staff members, have enjoyed a smooth journey thanks to the solicitude of Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the leaders of the Central People's Government, the direct assistance of General Chang Ching-wu, representative of the Central People's Government in Tibet, and the brotherly welcome and hospitality of the people's governments at all levels and of the broad masses of people. When we arrived in Peking yesterday, we were again warmly welcomed by Vice-Chairman Chu Teh, Premier Chou En-lai and leaders of the Central People's Government as well as representatives of people's organisations and government institutions. Today we are once more accorded welcome by Vice-Chairman Chu Teh at this banquet. We wish to express our heartfelt thanks and pay our lofty respects.

The National People's Congress will enact the Constitution for our country. This is an event of unprecedented importance in our history. It is a most glorious and happy event in my life to be able to attend the congress on behalf of the people of Tibet, to see the leaders of the Central People's Government and in particular to see Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the great leader of the people of all nationalities.

On our trip from Lhasa to Peking, we travelled for nearly two months and have been deeply impressed by the immense territory, enormous population and rich resources of our motherland. In the several years since liberation, the various construction work of our nation has achieved incomparably great successes as a result of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's brilliant leadership. Throughout our journey, we saw in particular how the people's governments of all

levels respect freedom of belief of all nationalities and how the national minorities carry out nationality regional autonomy in accordance with Chairman Mao Tse-tung's policy on equality and unity of nationalities and on freedom of religious belief. As a result, the relations between nationalities and their internal relations have basically changed from oppression and hatred during the reactionary rule of old China into fraternal relations of friendship, love and co-operation. This fully demonstrates the great success of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's policy on nationalities and religion. We shall learn humbly in all spheres so that the Tibetan nationality can advance and develop.

As far as Tibet is concerned, in the preceding period, imperialism had sown discord and estrangement in the relations between Tibet and the motherland. But since the founding of the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949, Chairman Mao Tse-tung's light has illumined the whole of China and in due course the people of Tibet also achieved their peaceful liberation in 1951. During the more than three years past, under the close concern of Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the guidance and assistance of General Chang Ching-wu, representative of the Central People's Government, and the People's Liberation Army and working personnel in Tibet, the face of Tibet has changed politically, economically and culturally and in other fields and has gradually stepped on the happy and prosperous road so that the unity between the Tibetan nationality and other fraternal nationalities, in particular, the unity between the Han and Tibetan nationalities, as well as the internal unity among the Tibetan nationality have become ever closer day by day.

Under the brilliant leadership of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, I myself and Panchen Ngoerhtehni as well as the ecclesiastic and temporal working personnel and monks and laymen in Tibet will from now on be united still more closely in our efforts for the building of a new Tibet, consolidating the national defence of the motherland and bettering the people's living standards.

First of all, please permit me to propose a toast and ask all of you to drink:

To the health of Vice-Chairman Chu Teh, Premier Chou En-lai and leaders of the Central People's Government;

To the great unity of all nationalities in China;

To the Communist Party of China, to peace, unification and prosperity of our great motherland;

To the long life of Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

WHO ARE THE ALLIES OF THE NEO-NAZIS?

JUDITH TODD

AT the beginning of 1953, Lord Russell of Liverpool, before starting a book condensing the many scattered published accounts of Nazi war crimes, received permission from the office of the Lord Chancellor (under whose jurisdiction he came as Assistant Judge-Advocate General) to write 'any book that was solely factual and historical and not derived from information from official sources'. On being sent the completed book in July, 1954, the Lord Chancellor instructed Lord Russell to withdraw the book or resign. Lord Russell resigned, and *The Scourge of the Swastika** was published by Cassell on August 19.

The Lord Chancellor explained that Lord Russell's treatment of the subject would 'give support to the opinions of those who are most strongly critical of the policy of giving Germany an opportunity, by rearmament or otherwise, of exerting an influence in public affairs'. Unless one of Lord Russell's former colleagues obliges us, we shall never know whether a rather susceptible Chancellor would have imposed a similar ban on a 'treatment' giving support (by a picture of the Nazis as kindly gentlemen), to the opinions of those in favour of German rearmament. But we do know very clearly, as a result of the book's appearance, to what lengths the apologists for German rearmament will go. Its reception by certain organs of the press showed such a pathological desire to minimise the crimes of the Nazis, such a deliberate attempt to divert attention from the unwelcome truth, as to remind us of the original Nazis' attempts to rewrite history and anthropology. These are the shifts to which their obsessional hatred of socialism drives the friends of the neo-Nazi alliance.

While the popular press treated the book itself as a piece of straight news like the Lord Chancellor's ban on it, the journals of opinion, read chiefly by the middle and upper classes, did not follow their usual reviewing practice, but expressed a special editorial policy in the selection of a peculiar set of persons as their reviewers. Instead of referring the book to known experts on Germany, or to those who have specialised in the study of the vast amount of evidence provided by the Nuremberg and other trials, the proprietors or editors summoned up the cold war experts.

**The Scourge of the Swastika*, by Lord Russell of Liverpool. 259 pp. Cassell. 15s.

Some of these experts had shown their virulence even while the U.S.S.R. was a war-time ally; others had gained a reputation as apologists for ex-Nazis; none had any notable qualifications for dealing with the subject under review. The choice of them was clearly political and connected, not with the subject of the book, but only with what the ruling class feared would be the effect of the facts given in the book. Taking them as a series, there appears a deliberate political gesture, which must have greatly reassured the neo-Nazis, and made it clear to them that none of the old literary canons of reviewing were to be allowed to stand in the way of this political move. The impression was given that if the directors of editorial policy had in any way been in the Lord Chancellor's position, they would have penalised the author, not for what he said (which was difficult to refute), but for being so inconveniently minded as to let out the truth.

Let us now examine some of the reviews in detail. The *Daily Telegraph* entrusted the book to Mr. F. A. Voigt, who, as the editor during the last war of *The Nineteenth Century and After*, will be remembered for his conduct of an unprecedented campaign against a war-time ally of Britain. Mr. Voigt objected to Lord Russell's style as sensational, the estimate of civilians killed by the Nazis as excessive, and the use of the term 'Slave labour' as a misnomer, since 'very many of the workers conscripted by the Germans and sent to Germany lived there in good conditions with regard to pay, food, accommodation and so on'.

The *Manchester Guardian* elevated its review to a leading article. Nevertheless, 'the book is not so important as some have thought it', and more congenial speculation followed about what the author would think of the 'barbarity . . . stretching East'. The conclusion was a brave Lancastrian attempt at the Yorkshire attitude: 'They're all daft save thee and me, and even th'art a bit queer'. 'It may be', said the *Guardian* wistfully, 'that it is not Germany alone that has gone mad but all East Europe'. And it may be, of course, that East Europe has come to its senses and that Cross Street, with its affection for the neo-Nazi alliance, is rapidly approaching the certifiable stage. How else to account for the following words?

But what he does not (and what perhaps no one can) tell us is the difference in extent and intensity between the barbarity he knows and has studied and the barbarity he does not know and cannot study.

Invention, in the total absence of evidence, is a sign of the irrational.

Miss Rebecca West, writing with less than her usual malicious assurance in the *Sunday Times*, found the book 'troubling'. The 'feeling of distress' which it caused her included a dilemma of her own making: 'Germany is full of journalists, lawyers and politicians who are not neo-Nazis', but resist all Allied attempts to punish the Nazi régime. 'This is a curious operation of the patriotic principle', worried Miss West, 'but they would not be such good Europeans in other ways if they were not patriots'. In other words, one must swallow a bit of neo-Nazism for the sake of a lot of 'good Europeans'. Mr. Edward Crankshaw in the *Observer*, tearing himself away for a moment from the shortcomings of the U.S.S.R., complained gloomily that the book was sensational and tasteless. This was the same work described by Mr. Kingsley Martin in the *New Statesman* as a 'cold, factual and unchallengeable record'.

The Times played it carefully: no correspondence from the Athenaeum, no leader, magisterial or arch: only a short review, traditionally anonymous, which wondered 'why the author should write this book at this moment' (thus showing ignorance of the laws of production of the book trade, and of Lord Russell's own statement that he began to write 'at the beginning of 1953').

The Tory *Spectator's* notice was by Mr. Denis Healey, Labour M.P., who deprecated this contribution to the 'paralysis of emotional rigidities' which 'may produce a split fatal to the Western Alliance'. Painfully overcoming the paralysis induced by Mr. Healey's turgid language, we learnt that, in spite of the book, we ought to be friends with the Adenauer régime, as 'there is a democratic government in Bonn', many major crimes were committed by non-German satellites, and the U.S.S.R. employs 'slave labour and genocide' (*sic*).

Thus it is clear, even from these few examples, that the appearance of Lord Russell's book, at the height of the E.D.C. and Bonn controversy, placed in a difficult situation some of the chief press champions of E.D.C. and German rearmament. They were only able to withdraw to previously prepared positions with heavy losses and under the covering fire of their reviewers, who employed three types of weapon: the minimiser, or 'It's-only-a-little-one'; the alternodenigrator, or 'The-Russians-are-much-worse'; and the discretion-plugger, or 'Rather-bad-form-just-now-old-boy'. As these defence mechanisms against logic were taken off the secret list by Aristotle, their use today is an index of the straits to which the fact-hating, logic-hating and truth-hating enemies of peace have been reduced.

DEBATE ON COLONIES AT BRIGHTON T.U.C.

We print speeches delivered on Friday, September 10, at the T.U.C. on the Fire Brigades Union resolution on colonial policy, reading as follows: 'Congress condemns the policy of the present Government, directed by the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, as one which has worsened Britain's relations with colonial peoples all over the world. Congress calls for an immediate cease-fire in Kenya and Malaya and for negotiations for a peaceful settlement and for a policy which provides in the colonial countries for:— (1) higher living standards, (2) full trade union and democratic rights, (3) abolition of the colour bar. Only such a policy can assist colonial peoples to self-government and create that friendship which is in the mutual interests of both the Colonial and the British peoples.'

Mr. Jack Grahl said:

Mr. President and Fellow Delegates:

My Union's purpose in presenting this motion to conference is to win a far greater understanding of the need for much more assistance being given to the colonial people in their struggle for national independence. We want to show that the winning of independence for the colonial people is of immediate and vital interest to the British workers and must be regarded as a struggle common to both.

This continually extending struggle of the colonial peoples for national liberation is the most important feature of the post-war world in which we live. In South-East Asia, in the Near and Middle East, over practically the whole continent of Africa, in the West Indies and in Latin-America hundreds of millions of people who for so long have suffered all the degradation and inhumanity of imperialist exploitation are now demanding an end to colonial rule and the right to live as free men.

Those who make enormous super-profits from exploitation in the colonies would have us believe that the great movements for national liberation are the work of a few

bands of terrorists, that a few people are trying to disturb law and order, and that the majority of colonial peoples are perfectly happy to live serenely under the care of their imperialist benefactors. Fortunately the truth is readily available from unimpeachable sources.

Let us take a glimpse at the living conditions of colonial workers as described in the United Nations' publication entitled 'Special Study on Social Conditions in Non-Self Governing Territories' published last year. Here we have some amazing disclosures. On page 149, figures are given of the annual income of Africans and non-Africans in Kenya and Northern Rhodesia for the year 1949. In Kenya, Africans, who constitute 97 per cent. of the population, receive less than half of the total of personal incomes. Income per head of Kenya Africans averages £5 18s. per year, about two shillings and three pence per week, or if you like —less than the price of twenty Woodbines.

Contrast this with an official advertisement by the Government of Kenya recently. It is headed: 'Overseas Appointments — Chief Officers (Prisons). Required by the Government of Kenya'. The com-

mencing salary is given as rising to £1,134 per year, plus a gratuity of at least £162 payable after two years' satisfactory service. The outfit allowance is given as £50 and the uniform allowance as £10. The advertisement then goes on to outline other attractions which go along with the job. Here we have an advertisement for men of Britain to become jailers of the African people, and for doing this job, they will get in uniform and other allowances alone—*ten times the yearly income of the African.*

The state of affairs in Northern Rhodesia is even worse. Here the African people—who constitute 98.1 per cent. of the population, which is almost everyone, get only 30 per cent. of the total personal incomes. The average annual income per head is £4 2s. or 1s. 6d. per week. Although this is bad enough, it by no means explains the full extent of the exploitation which goes on. For example, in 1949, out of the total national product of Northern Rhodesia, nearly one-third went in income paid abroad, mainly to Britain. One-third of a country's annual wealth gone in sheer plunder! And, as we have seen, of the two-thirds which are left, the African population receive only 30 per cent. So of the total national product, 98 per cent. of the African population gets only 30 per cent.

What is doubly important for us is that the very same monopolists who are so ruthlessly exploiting colonial workers are the same monopoly capitalists against whom we struggle for decent living standards in Britain. Time alone prevents me giving many more details from this very revealing United Nations' publication, in connection with housing, education and health in the colonies. Such facts, for example, as that in many British colonies the infantile mortality rate

is 400 in every 1,000 against 27 in every 1,000 in Britain; that the average expectation of life in the colonies is 30 years as against 65 in Britain.

But behind these figures lies incredible human tragedy of millions of people, hungry, disease ridden, badly clothed and living in huts and hovels which literally no farmer would keep pigs in. If we were to see our children with bellies swollen from hunger, with their young haggard faces showing outwardly the torture of their lives from the cradle to an early grave—if our children suffered one-hundredth of the misery of colonial children, then the British workers would be struggling in the same way as the people of Malaya and Kenya against those responsible for such inhumanities.

The colossal military expenditure involved in the suppression of the colonial people has been one of the principal factors in Britain's now chronic economic crisis and directly contributed to our subservience and loss of independence to the United States, a subservience which must increase the longer we maintain our present imperialist colonial policy.

Now that the British people have themselves lost a great part of their national independence and sovereignty, and are beginning to struggle for their own independence those words, precious to all internationalists, that 'A nation which oppresses others cannot itself be free' were never truer, and the British people will never win independence if they deny the same rights to colonial peoples.

I will say, in conclusion, that this conference must, therefore, demand an end to British and Colonial lads losing their lives in senseless colonial wars; that we must demand an immediate cease-fire in Malaya and negotiations with the National Liber-

ation Movement based on independence for Malaya; an immediate cease-fire in Kenya, the release of all patriots and the recognition of the Kenya people's national demands and their right to own their own land.

We must also call for the withdrawal of troops from other colonies and dependent territories including British Guiana where the constitution should be immediately restored.

To those who wail about Britain losing sources of raw materials and so on, we reply that when our engineering factories are exporting tractors, mining equipment and food processing machinery instead of guns, tanks and planes; when our lads go over not to kill and be killed but to render assistance in the peaceful development of those countries' resources, based on mutual interests and benefits, we will establish such bonds of friendship that no power on earth can break.

Mr. Abe Moffat said :

I come to the rostrum to second this resolution because first of all the Miners' delegation is supporting it and secondly that we believe that it is of such importance as to warrant receiving the support of Congress. On many occasions previously this Congress has declared itself in favour of a higher standard of living for colonial people and this was reaffirmed in the President's speech at this Congress and also in the General Council Report.

It is rather regrettable that at this time when we are making these declarations an attempt is being made to reduce the already low standard of living of the colonial people. If we read the General Council Report we find that one Arbitration Court actually gave an award for a wage reduction for rubber workers in Malaya. In other

words, the big industrialists are not satisfied with the super-profits which they have made from cheap colonial labour, they want to extract still greater profits at the expense of the sweat and blood and low wages of the colonial people. I am sure that Congress will not tolerate or support such a policy, and the resolution deals with this aspect by demanding a higher standard of living for colonial people in Kenya and Malaya.

The other important aspect of this resolution deals with peace and liberty in the colonies. When looking at the situation none of us can be happy or have an easy conscience. The Colonial Secretary informed the House of Commons this year that in a period of 18 months we had shot and killed 3,399 Africans in Kenya, captured 1,380, with over 300 wounded. Further, if there be any doubt in our minds about the atrocities being carried out in Kenya, then I would recall to the attention of delegates the case of Captain Griffiths which shocked every decent-minded man and woman.

Then take Malaya where a similar situation prevails. The war has now been going on for seven years and there is no sign of its coming to an end. We are told at the beginning that it was a war against a few bandits, but when a war has been carried on for a period of seven years, with all the weapons of modern warfare, then in my opinion we are fighting something more than a few bandits. This is confirmed when we examine the statement of General Templer that 'if only I had the support of the Malayan people, I could bring this war to a speedy ending'. This shows that we are not fighting for the Malayan people but fighting against them, and we can never win the support of the Malayan people because they believe, and rightly believe, that

they are fighting against terrible poverty and for freedom.

The part of the resolution which deals with this situation calls upon the Congress to support an immediate cease-fire and negotiations to bring about a peaceful settlement. Is it too much to ask Congress to support this? It was done in Korea and Indo-China and irrespective of our different viewpoints on the character of these wars, I have never found any trade unionist objecting to the negotiations which took place to bring about peace. The resolution asks us to do the same thing in Kenya and Malaya and in doing this we will not only save innocent lives of men, women and children in the colonial countries, but will also save the precious young lives of Britain which are being sacrificed in these senseless colonial wars.

Mr. Arthur Deakin, opposing the resolution, devoted his speech mainly to an attack on the U.S.S.R. Mr. A. L. Horner then spoke :

I am speaking for the British miners' delegation. Mr. Deakin has sought to attribute to those persons who support this motion, in accordance with his usual style, an intention which has nothing to do with the purposes of those supporters. We are not talking about Lithuania or Latvia or any such country; we are talking in this motion about the colonial countries under the control of this British Government.

I happen to have had some experience of Mr. Oliver Lyttelton when he was Lord President of the Council during the last war and when he told the miners in no uncertain terms that we should never have national negotiating machinery, nor an increase in wages—which were ultimately conceded. But that has as much to do with this question as Mr. Deakin's talk about Lithuania and Latvia.

The fact is (and let us be clear about it) that this small nation of 50 million people seeking to survive on this island has not earned its own living for 200 years. That is true, and I challenge any member of the General Council to deny it. We have lived on the blood and exploitation of colonial workers. Much as we may regret it, and bad as it may be for our bodies, it is good for our souls: we are going, from now on, to have to earn our own living, because the colonial workers are no longer prepared to carry us on their shoulders.

I know all about the contributions we have made, the scientific developments, and the introduction of technology, but you cannot give these people a knowledge, an education, an understanding of technology, unless you give them a sense of equality with you: and you can no longer with guns exploit the Malaysians or the people of Kenya.

I am one of the persons who joined the Irish Citizen Army in the wars when we fought the 'Black and Tans', and what were we called then? —'terrorists, brigands, assassins'. Now we recognise that Ireland was justified in the fight she made for the independence of her country, and we learned the hard way—or the easy way—that when you are opposed to a people, as the British Government was opposed to the Irish people, you cannot win because the people are opposed to you.

You are not fighting assassins, you are not fighting terrorists, you are fighting liberators of their country, and it is better that we in this Trade Union Movement do as we did in India, give them their freedom and remain their friends rather than let them tear their freedom from us in blood, and sweat, and tears, and leave them enemies of this country for generations to come.



Literature *in NEW CHINA*

ON May 4, 1919, Peking students, demonstrating against the Versailles Treaty and a warlord government's cowardly acquiescence in Japanese pressure, touched off a nation-wide movement. China was entering a new era, casting aside her illusions of the Western Powers, discovering her own heritage, feeling on her face the wind blowing across the border from the Soviet Union. Out of this ferment, with its anti-imperialist and anti-feudal overtones, came a cultural revolution of which Mao Tse-tung has written: 'Since the beginning of Chinese history there has never been such a great and thorough cultural revolution.'

Yet the fruits of this revolt against outmoded form, Confucian dogma, a constricting classical literary language, are almost unknown in the English-speaking world. 'Replace the old literature with a new literature' was one of its slogans. But how many English readers know of Ting Ling, Chao Shu-li, Ouyang Shan and others who have helped to do this 'replacing'? Or, for that matter, of so choice and daring a writer as Lu Hsun? The loss has been ours, and we can be grateful to the Foreign Languages Press and the Cultural Press of Peking for helping to fill this gap by giving us well-translated, excellently produced novels and works of criticism valuable in themselves, and for the foreign reader especially useful for the way in which they present, in

vivid, human terms, the trials, errors and achievements of a revolutionary period.*

The doyen of them all is Lu Hsun, who turned on a decayed society with savage satire, writing in the 'dark night' of what he called 'a man-eating society'. Read, for example, 'A Madman's Diary' in *Selected Stories of Lu Hsun*, his first story, a bitter attack on the feudal family system, and the poignant picture of a countryside on the verge of ruin in 'My Native Home'. Or his masterpiece, *The True Story of Ah Q*, with its sympathy for the poor and its sharp delineation of the weakness of those whose class consciousness is still undeveloped through his hero, Ah Q, continually humiliated, continually persuaded that he has won victory by his humiliations, and finally executed because, without understanding the meaning of revolution, and to raise himself above his tormentors, he proclaims himself a revolutionary.

Lu Hsun was more than a storyteller and satirist. He was a seminal force, enriching the mainstream of Chinese realism with translations of Gorki, Gogol and Fadéyev, pioneer-

**Selected Stories of Lu Hsun*, 254 pp., 3s. 6d.; *The True Story of Ah Q*, by Lu Hsun, 112 pp., 1s. 6d.; *The Sun Shines Over the Sangkan River*, by Ting Ling, 348 pp., 3s. 6d.; *Changes in Li Village and Rhymes of Li Yu-tsai*, by Chao Shu-li, 224 pp., 3s., and 156 pp., 1s. 6d.; *China's New Literature and Art*, by Chou Yang, 156 pp., 1s. 6d.; *Fables of Feng Hsueh-feng*, 70 pp., 2s.; *Chinese Literature*, Quarterly, 1s. 6d. Foreign Languages Press, Peking; Collet's, London.

ing the revival of the woodcut and introducing Chinese artists to Kathe Kollwitz, urging more love for, more research into, China's culture, and nurturing young writers like Feng Hsueh-feng (whose translated *Fables* are beautifully illustrated by Huang Yung-yu). Because he worked when the Kuomintang was at its height, however, his first concern was to fight an old order, though his heart sought the new. But between 1937 and 1942 Chinese literature embarked on a new stage. The war against Japan had begun. The Communist-led Border Regions were stronger. Guerilla warfare was spreading. Writers, poets and journalists were slipping through the Kuomintang blockade to Yen-an, to offer themselves to resistance, and Mao Tse-tung's address to the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art in 1942 crystallised this change. Whom should literature and art serve? Workers, peasants and soldiers. From this Forum stemmed a literature that saw the future clearly outlined, took as its heroes the common people, and looked to the common people for its audience.

Among the many works that followed were Ting Ling's *The Sun Shines Over the Sangkan River*, a novel of land reform in north-east China, Tsao Ming's *The Moving Force*, and Chao Shu-li's *Changes in Li Village* and *Rhymes of Li Yu-tsai* and *Other Stories*, which are now available in translation. *The Moving Force* has special interest as one of the first novels of factory life. It describes how a power plant, built by forced labour during the Japanese occupation and despoiled by the Kuomintang, is brought back to life by the ingenuity and courage of its workers at a time when Kuomintang irregulars and saboteurs are still active in the district. Chao Shu-li's

Rhymes of Li Yu-tsai, however, is something of a landmark. Chou Yang, the critic, has called it 'the representative work of Liberated Area literature'. It recounts the struggles of a village which has passed through land reform, but where landlords, through the peasants' timidity and the failure of a cadre to identify himself with their interests, still dominate community life. Through it run the jingles of Li Yu-tsai, the village rhymster, whose verses never reach the ears of the rich, but lodge in the memory of the poor, and become an instrument of the downfall of landlords and their 'dog's legs'. The story is simple enough, popular, and popularly told, but it catches the breath of the countryside, its characters are flesh and blood speaking authentically, and it makes no concessions. Black, white, grey—they are all here.

The refusal to make concessions, the determination to see events as a whole, is, in fact, characteristic of these stories and the many stories and novels published in the English-language quarterly, *Chinese Literature*. The Chinese writer has come to terms with society. He has learnt to work within it, and for it, to study his subject and his audience anew. Ting Ling, working as a member of a land reform team to gather material; Tsao Ming, conducting literacy classes for workers, living at a power plant for five months; Chao Shu-li, once a village schoolmaster and rural cadre, trying out his stories on peasants, taking their criticisms to heart; they and many another have, in great measure, bridged the chasm that divided the literate man, the scholar, who in traditional estimate could 'master all knowledge under Heaven' by sitting and reading in his study, from the vitality of the workaday world.

This has not been easy or painless. Just how hard it has been for the writer and artist to integrate themselves with society, to break out of their isolation and plunge into working life, and how crucial is careful criticism and constant examination of their answers to 'Whom do we serve?' and 'How do we serve?', is brought out very clearly in Chou Yang's critical essays in *China's New Literature and Art*, and the essays of Chou En-lai, Kuo Mo-jo, the poet, and others, in *The People's New Literature*. But the struggle has borne fruit. To the Chinese, these works of literature are weapons to destroy and create, to 'replace the old morality with a new morality'. To the English reader they bring freshness, encouragement, and an intimacy with the difficulties and triumphs of an ancient and young people.

WILLIAM LOCKE

CHINA'S LEADER

Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Volume Two. (296 pp. Lawrence & Wishart. 6s.)

THE period here covered is 1937-1938, the period of the Spanish civil war. Madrid fell to the enemy in March, 1939. It is appalling to reflect what the state of the world would be today if democracy had suffered a similar defeat in China. If we can today congratulate ourselves on an epoch-making victory, the writings of Mao Tse-tung enable us to understand how it was won.

It is heartening to see how Comrade Mao himself, the Party, and the people measure up to the demand history has made upon them. ('Our task is to lead a great nation of several hundred million people to carry on such a struggle as was never waged before.') To grasp the full import of the struggle in China itself

Marxist Quarterly

EDITOR: EMILE BURNS

October, 1954

TOWARDS PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

George Matthews

AN ESTIMATION OF LEWIS GRASSIC GIBBON'S 'A SCOTS QUAIR'

Ian Milner

THE CONTRIBUTION OF PAVLOV TO MEDICINE

Ruscoe Clark

ARBITRATION IN INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

J. Hendy

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

George E. Rude

2/6

From all booksellers and
CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.
2 Parton Street, London, W.C. 1.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

was difficult enough. 'To this day we have not yet understood the whole of Japanese imperialism, nor the whole of China.' But the Party and the people had to understand that they owed a duty not only to China but to the world. 'China has carried on resistance not only to save herself but also to discharge her great duty in the world anti-fascist front.'

In the effort to understand to the full Japanese imperialism and the role of China in the world-revolution Mao Tse-tung had earlier convinced himself that 'the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is a universally applicable theory'. But it is not an easy theory to master, and on this as on all points Mao is completely realistic. So recently as October, 1938, he was still asking for only one or two hundred fully-matured Marxists. 'Our Party has now a better grasp of Marxism-Leninism than in the past, but its knowledge is still far from being wide or deep. . . . So far as the people shouldering the main responsibilities of leadership are concerned, if there are in our Party one or two hundred comrades who have acquired a knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, which is systematic and not fragmentary, practical and not abstract, the fighting capacity of our Party will be greatly heightened and our work in defeating Japanese imperialism will be accelerated.'

As a contribution to the Chinese understanding of fundamental Marxism Mao published in August, 1937, his philosophical essay *On Contradiction*. The basic theory is, of course, taken with acknowledgments from writings accessible to students in the eleventh volume of Lenin's *Selected Works*. Its applications to

the Chinese scene constitute its great and striking originality. Everywhere throughout the volume is found the same freshness of touch. The three pages (74-76) called *Combat Liberalism* could not be better. Move forward a hundred pages to the middle of the long series of lectures called *On the Protracted War*; you will find (pp. 170-174) a factually-based, confident prophecy, since fulfilled, of the success of the Anti-Japanese War. It is a fair illustration of the Marxist ability to predict. Mao's writings are more than books: they are part of the history of our time.

BENJAMIN FARRINGTON

COLLET'S

New additions to the
popular series of

**POCKET CLASSICS
OF MARXISM**

ENGELS
Socialism : Utopian and
Scientific
PRICE 6d. POST 3d.

LENIN
Socialism and Religion
PRICE 2d. POST 2d.

STALIN
Marxism and Problems
of Linguistics
PRICE 3d. POST 2d.

All three for only 1/3 post
free.

Send for full list of these book-
lets that are made to fit your
pocket in size and price.

COLLET'S BOOKSHOPS
44 & 45 MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3,
and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for
transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

weight in gold'; it certainly costs its weight in pence, and more, to produce a copy and send it out. One trade union branch, instead of taking four-month trial subscriptions, ordered six copies of the September issue first, to see how members liked it. That raises an interesting point. A criticism of the Midget is that printing only the first page of articles 'leaves a feeling of frustration, for you turn the page wanting to go on with the article, and you can't. It whets the appetite—but to satisfy your hunger, you have to become a regular reader.' True! Others are anxious that we should not discontinue sending out issues of L.M. which contain an article a reader thinks will especially interest some friend. From Wales: 'My own experience is that sample copies of the magazine are extremely effective when shown or sent to likely people.' A Middlesex man feels that he 'could do better with extra copies of the current issue sent to would-be sympathisers', and makes this interesting point: 'Most readers, I think, go to the L.M.—and they feel they cannot wait to read it—for its revelation of fresh data and its powerful working-class interpretation of leading events and trade union affairs. The date and 'hot' comment is most important. I'd

prefer to see extra pulls of certain articles for the factory enlistment of readers—of current articles.' (That interesting idea, I'm afraid, might be difficult.) But of course we keep open our offer to send particular issues on request; but where it is desired to give a quick general impression of the character of the magazine, we find the Midget has a special job to do. See the new specimen-and-Midget forms on the back cover.

'Shrunk in the wash, eh?'

HERE are some adjectives used about the Midget: *Loco man*: 'Just the job'; *A Labour M.P.*: 'First class!'; *Yorkshire C.P. reader*: 'We were delighted'; *Carpenter*: 'Wonderful idea'; *Teacher*: 'Brilliant piece of advertising'; *Londoner*: 'A little gem'; *L.P. reader*: 'Brilliant, original, attractively printed, and articles and drawings well-chosen'; *Staffs. reader*: 'Why haven't I thought of this before?' And, of course, some good-humoured jibes: 'Shrunk in the wash, eh?'; and 'See you've beaten the *Daily Fiddler Junior* to it.'

I wish I had room to mention all the ideas for using it which readers have suggested. These must wait till next month. August donations total:

£41 1s. 4d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from: 'American Observers', standing-in for British Guiana 'in memory of Toussaint L'Ouverture', £1; 'English Observer', standing-in for Guatemala 'in memory of Thomas Jefferson', 1s.; 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.

STEADY MONEY came from: Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s.; A.M.T. for Fernando, Portugal, 1s.; J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; 'Cambridge Seniors', £4 10s.; P.O.H., 'Dublin', 4s.; 'Red Sergeant', 5s.; 'Socialist Sailor' (pre-paid); S. Mill (pre-paid); 'New York' (pre-paid); 'Personal Greetings from U.S.A.', £3; Marie Philibert (pre-paid); D. H. Strathern and Friends (pre-paid); H.G.B., 2s.; D. Rees, 10s.; Olivia Greene, £4; D. M. Clarke, £1; E. D. McCallum, 5s.; R.F.B., £3; R. McLeod, 10s.; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; H. A. Singh, 2s.; S. Morrissey, 10s.; A.W.K., 2s.; Royston Green, 3s. 6d.; H. Tinkler, 5s.; J. Macdonald, 4s.; 'L'Humanité', 3s.; H.G.K., 2s.; E.J.B., 10s.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS came from: J. F. Shine, 11s.; M. Darby, 2s.; H. S. Richards, £5; G. W. Grainger, 2s.; S. Hettleman, 2s. 6d.; O. M. Ford, 7s.; P. S. Gupta, 1s.; A. A. Wills, 7s.; E. Whelen, £1 4s.; J. McLeod, 7s.; Anon, £4 2s.; A.H. (B.W.I.), 11s.; A.H. (B.A.O.R.), 5s.; A. Perkins, 7s.; H. H. Hookham, 2s.; N. Nutting, 1s.; W. Caldwell, 2s.; Anon (Birkenhead), 10s.; A. J. Salmon, 1s.; E. P. Young, 2s.; W. Eckersley, 5s.; W.H.J., 2s.; H. E. Rank, 1s.; 'Lorna', 5s. 6d.; H. Syder, 2s. 6d.; C. Thornhill, 5s.; S. D. Humphries, 2s.; R. E. Gillett, 1s.; G. Mearns, 2s.; Anna Dutt, 10s.; Violet Dutt, £1; I. Rubenstein, 5s.; B.H. (U.S.A.), £2 9s.; D.S. (U.S.A.), 6s. 10d.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No. L99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WHY NOT BY POST ?

Here's the Subscription Form:

NAME
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS

I wish to become a postal subscriber and enclose 18s. (home) \$3.00 (U.S.A. and Canada). 19s. (elsewhere) for a year, beginning with the..... issue.

(SIGNED)

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

LABOUR RESEARCH

October issue includes :

"U.S. Anti-Trade Union Laws "

"National Income "

"Facts on Formosa "

Monthly, 9d. ; p.a. 10s. 6d.

**LABOUR RESEARCH
DEPARTMENT**

2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly

Authoritative voice of the
American progressive
movement

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Annual Subscription 24s.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W C.1.

FOR THE MIDGET

Send a Midget Labour Monthly with the 4-months-for-3 trial sub. to:—

Name

Address

Mention that I could book the order through my usual agent (*delete if inapplicable*)

I enclose 3d. Signed

towards cost Address

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy of the issue to:—

(1) Name

Address

(2) Name

Address

You may mention my name, Signed

or/I enclose note to be sent on. Address

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3